

The Classical Journal

APR 2 - 193

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND
SOUTH WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW
ENGLAND AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXX

APRIL, 1935

Number 7

Cicero and Modern Politics	B. L. Ullman	385
An English Teacher Uses His Latin	Virgil K. Whitaker	403
The Evolving Latin Course	Mildred Dean	411
The Modernity of Aristotle's <i>Ethics</i>	L. R. Lind	418
The Homeric Lotus	Homer Economidis	424
Notes		428
Terence, <i>Phormio</i> 231-34 and Livy I, xxviii, 4-6	Clyde Marley	
Chiefs, Modern and Ancient	Hubert McNeill Potest	
The "Moose" of the Hercynian Forest	J. Macle Rife	
Book Reviews		432
<i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i> , ed. Wilhelmina Van Ingen (Fraser); William W. Tarn, <i>Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind</i> (Brady); <i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i> , ed. David Moore Robinson (Mylonas); <i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i> , XLIII (Dean); Mary Johnston, <i>Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy</i> (Gammere).		
Hints for Teachers		440
Current Events		444
Recent Books		446

PRINTED BY
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the coöperation of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States
Publication Office: 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis.

Editor-in-Chief

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

Editor for the Middle Western States

WILLIAM E. GWATKIN, JR.
University of Missouri

Editor for New England

RUSSEL M. GEER
Brown University

Editor for the Pacific States

ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY
University of California at Los Angeles

Associate Editors

ROY C. FLECKINGER
University of Iowa
CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston
G. A. HARRER
University of North Carolina

VICTOR D. HILL
Ohio University
FRANKLIN H. POTTER
University of Iowa
JOHN BARKER STEARNS
Dartmouth College
EUGENE TAVENNER
Washington University

DOROTHY M. BELL
216 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
FREDERIC S. DUNN
University of Oregon
W. A. ELLIS
Lombard, Illinois
FRED L. FARLEY
College of the Pacific

Business Manager
WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews, in general to Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Russel M. Geer, Brown University, Providence, R. I.; from the Pacific States, to Arthur P. McKinlay, University of California at Los Angeles, California.

Concerning Special Departments, to those named at the head of each department.

Concerning Membership in the Associations:

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. For the states included in this Association, see the list of officers.

In the Classical Association of New England, to John Barker Stearns, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

Concerning Subscriptions (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Concerning Missing Numbers, to F. S. Dunham, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and so far as the reserve stock will permit.

Concerning Advertisements, to Walter Miller, Advertising Manager, Columbia, Mo.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is printed monthly except in July, August, and September by The George Banta Publishing Company, 450 Ahnaip St., Menasha, Wis. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75), on single copies 5 cents (total 35 cents).

The membership fee in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with the addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at a special rate.

Twenty-five reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles, book reviews, and notes. Additional reprints, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis., on October 19, 1934. Additional entry as second-class matter at Ann Arbor, Mich., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1934.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXX

APRIL, 1935

NUMBER 7

CICERO AND MODERN POLITICS¹

By B. L. ULLMAN
University of Chicago

The cry we hear all about us that we must train our boys and girls for citizenship is no new one, and the answer of us Latin teachers is just as old. A dozen and more years ago we answered it in the *Report of the Classical Investigation*. Over twenty years ago I tried to answer it in a paper similar in subject to the present one. But now, perhaps, the cry about citizenship is more insistent than ever. It is raised by those who would increase the study of the social sciences at the expense of the languages. They forget that the study of a language like Latin is an education in itself. They forget that a good Latin teacher is at one and the same time a good English teacher and a good social science teacher. And they base some of their most effective arguments on the utterances of those narrow-visioned Latin teachers who insist that the aim of the Latin teacher is to teach Latin and nothing else. Let us not talk about by-products—that was well and good a generation ago, but today the by-product is the main product. The aim of Latin teaching should be to educate the child, with all that this implies—better knowledge of his mother tongue, appreciation of literary

¹ A revised form of an address given before the Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity, October 20, 1934. An earlier article on "American Politics and the Teaching of Cicero" was published in the *Classical Weekly* vii (1913), 18, and one on "Political Questions Suggested by Cicero's Orations against Catiline" was published in *Latin Notes Supplement* 27 (1927).

art, better understanding of human nature, an open-minded attitude toward the ideas of others, higher moral standards. We are preëminently purveyors of general education, not providers of a tool. We must all not only accept that view, but we must fight for it with conviction or else prepare to see Latin disappear from our schools. The logic of the situation is inescapable. If our sole purpose is to teach Latin for its own sake or for College Board examinations, we are bound to see the day—and that soon—so devoutly desired by a certain school superintendent who believes that there is room for only twenty-five or thirty Latin teachers in the entire United States and who classes Latin with such languages as Sanskrit and Korean. Remember that that superintendent is not a solitary freak in this opinion, freakish though that opinion may seem to us. We have in Latin an unsurpassed instrument for general education; let us use it for that purpose. We can well be proud of our pupils who go on with their study of Latin in college and graduate school, but no greater calamity could happen to high-school Latin than to have it studied only by prospective teachers.

But enough of this. Let us pass to our more immediate concern. As social science or history teachers we have the responsibility of showing the values of historical study. The establishment of ideals, social-mindedness, tolerance, certainly constitutes one value. And the development of these leads to a better comprehension of current problems and a clearer insight into the future. To be sure, an eminent historian has recently said: "Many historians consider that through observing the past they may foresee the future; but I am not of their number."² The brevity of Professor Rostovtzeff's remark gives, I think, a false impression of his attitude. It is true that the study of history cannot enable us to forecast future events with as much accuracy and certainty as a study of astronomy permits us to predict an eclipse. When history repeats itself it does not do so verbatim. The component parts of an event are too numerous and varied to make it possible for them to come together again in an identical formation. But human nature does not change much, and history is the story of human

² M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Out of the Past of Greece and Rome* (1932), p. x.

nature. So it is true that history both does and does not repeat itself. After all nothing is truer than a paradox.

Many historians, because they feel that history does not repeat itself completely, are very suspicious of parallels. It is certainly true that many suspicious parallels have been perpetrated on a guileless world. But better a bad parallel than none at all, especially in the classroom. Why is the minister in the pulpit permitted to draw—and applauded for doing it—the most far-fetched parallels between biblical and modern situations, when at the same time the teacher in the classroom is asked to adhere to standards of sober unimaginative truth that befit only the seminar and the learned society? Of course I should prefer to draw parallels that are apt and that will meet the approval of a historians' board of censorship. But my slogan is "My parallel, right or wrong."

Our opportunities and duties as teachers of the social sciences begin in the first year and continue in the second; but it is in the third year with its emphasis on Cicero that we have perhaps our best chance to perform this function. In the first place, the numerous allusions to earlier Roman history in Cicero's commonly read orations give a surprisingly full background of Roman history. In the second place, there is the opportunity of stressing similarities and differences between Cicero's Rome and our America—and by ours I mean yours and mine, Hoover's and Roosevelt's, Dillinger's and Hauptmann's, Congressman Beck's and Upton Sinclair's. In the infinite variety and complexity and contradictoriness of American life there surely is much to remind us of Rome.

In teaching Cicero's orations we must give the pupil a background of Roman politics. I mean not merely such matters as are found in all our textbooks but the more interesting aspects, political in the popular sense of the term. Though the Romans had no party system as we understand that expression, there were two well-defined groups, conservative and radical. The former were the senators, called *optimates* or *boni*. The latter were the *populares*.

In the methods they used to attract the voter these parties were not unlike those which exist today. Passing over such technical

terms as *candidatus*, *ambitio*, *prensatio*, and the light they throw on campaign methods, we may mention the prevalence of bribery, something not unknown in this modern age. An excellent example is furnished by the Murena case, which was intimately connected with the conspiracy of Catiline.³

A second matter is the franchise. We recall that Cicero was a *novus homo*—"a new man"—and we recall how often he comments on this fact and how proud he is of his achievements in spite of it. What does this phrase mean? It is a matter of the greatest significance for Roman history in general and for the orations against Catiline in particular. The Romans did not have the individual equal ballot. They voted by classes, and the number of persons in the various classes varied considerably, with the result that the votes of certain individuals were far more valuable than those of others. This restriction of the franchise made it possible for a small group to keep control of the government. Cicero was one of the few men to break through this ring.

Such a situation is a familiar one in many countries and has at times led to revolts. Even in the United States there are certain analogous conditions. There is what is called "nullification." The federal constitution calls for an apportionment of representatives among the states in accordance with their population. The rapid growth of certain sections as compared with others makes a reapportionment necessary at frequent intervals. But when no reapportionment is made for a long time, as sometimes happens, the vote of an individual for representative is worth much less in one state than in another. This is also true within the several states. In Illinois the city of Chicago has far less than its constitutional quota of representatives in the state legislature. As a result the representatives of the rural sections have had the upper hand and the vote of the people living on the farms and in the small towns has been much more influential than that of the urban population.

In the case of senators our constitution deliberately provides that each state shall have two, regardless of the size and popula-

³ For details on this and on some of the other points mentioned see my paper in *Latin Notes Supplement*.

tion of the state. The result is that a vote for senator in Nevada, with a population of 91,000, is worth 138 times as much as a corresponding vote in New York, with a population of twelve and a half million, and 105 times as much as the vote in Pennsylvania, which has over nine and a half million people.

(A third matter is that of campaign issues. The greatest of these in the last century and more of the Roman republic centred about agrarian legislation. The issue was a simple one but not easily solved, especially after it became a football of the politicians, who used it for their own ends. In one way or another the public lands in Italy had been acquired by a small group of men. The problem was to get better distribution, especially since the population had increased and the large landowners did not as a rule grow wheat. As a result two things happened: Many people wanted land who could not get it, and the scarcity of wheat necessitated importation and higher prices.

Different men offered different solutions. Some were in favor of confiscation of the lands that originally belonged to the government and of large estates in general; others advocated their purchase. Tiberius Gracchus wanted agrarian legislation so that unemployed Romans could be sent to farms. From the time of the Gracchi to that of Cicero and Caesar this was a very live issue. In the year of his consulship Cicero made four speeches on proposed agrarian legislation. Honest differences of opinion and political insincerity constantly prevented a real solution of the question.

The land question has figured prominently in the modern world. It played an important part in the various revolutions in Mexico and Russia. In the United States we have had relatively little trouble with this problem, as we have been alert to avoid the exploitation of land. The question has come up chiefly in connection with mineral and oil lands or lands near irrigation or water-power projects. The whole conservation movement is related to the agrarian problem. It is interesting to recall that it was this movement that gave Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania a national reputation and led to his entry into politics.

In some parts of the country there is a great deal of tenant farm-

ing. The evils of this system present some analogies to the Roman situation. But the main farm problem of the hour is quite a different one: that of reducing the farmer's debts and of giving him a fair price for his products. This problem, too, the Romans had to face, especially in Cicero's time, as we shall see.

The CAL, or California Authority for Land, is part of Upton Sinclair's scheme. It envisages the establishment of land colonies for the unemployed on land that has been taken over by the state for failure to pay taxes. This is exactly like the agrarian schemes of the Gracchi and their successors. Apparently the plan does not, in its present stage at least, give permanent title to the workers. This was true also of the Gracchan legislation, at least to the extent that the holder was not permitted to sell his land and was forced to pay at least a nominal rental.

The problem of getting enough to eat is an eternal one and naturally gets into politics. The form of the problem varies from time to time. During and after the World War the cost of living rose more rapidly than wages, and the wage earner had difficulty in getting enough to eat for his wages. More recently the cost of living has been low, but the wage earner has had no job and no wages. The result for him is the same. The Romans had the problem ever with them. Their example is a warning to us to keep the question out of politics as a party issue. The many wheat laws (or corn laws, as we still call them in imitation of the English usage) were the Roman solution of the problem. The plan of Gaius Gracchus was perhaps intended to prevent wild fluctuations in the price of wheat, caused by alternating crop failures and banner crops. To achieve this purpose he seems to have built grain elevators in Rome in which to store wheat bought at reasonable prices. He then sold it to the Romans at half the current price. The aim was to provide for the Roman consumer rather than to aid the farmer, but the project bears some resemblance to our farmers' coöperative movement. In later years grain was sold below cost, for political profit, and finally it was given away to thousands of Roman citizens. The proud phrase *civis Romanus sum* came to have an economic value. The end of it all is summed up in Juvenal's remark that the Roman populace cared for nothing

but *panem et circenses*, which we may paraphrase as a "square meal and a movie."

Today the solution is slightly different: In England there is the dole; in America we have the same institution under the name of "relief." Already some persons have reached the *panem et circenses* stage. A beauty-parlor operator reports that she hired a barber. When he did not turn up, she investigated and learned that he and his wife had decided it was better to stay on relief. They had enough for food and an occasional movie, and besides the husband could stay at home and take care of the baby while the wife went shopping or to a show.

A newspaper subscriber, noting the announcement that free vaudeville was to be provided and associating this with the bread line, concluded that bread and circuses had arrived and wondered whether some historian would some day be writing of the decline and fall of the American republic.

Now direct relief by the federal government is to be superseded by an enlarged public works program. This method was not unknown to the Romans. Gaius Gracchus undertook an ambitious program of road building, partly at least to find employment for the jobless. No doubt this plan was followed on other occasions too.

There are those who say today that the relief fund, the bounties to farmers, and the public works fund are clever political devices to retain the support of the voter. They assert that Maine went Democratic in the election of 1934 because of the large sums that the government had spent there on various projects. Colonel Theodore Roosevelt says that the Maine election was "bought and paid for" with "millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money." Whether this be true or not, the claim reminds us of the methods used by the Roman politicians who gained or kept their popularity by free distribution of wheat. Official statements have been issued that about 15,000,000 people are now on relief and that the number will increase to 18 or 20 million this winter (1934-35). This is about 17 per cent of the population. In 63 B.C. about 200,000 persons (really families) received the dole, about 11 per cent of the population of Italy and probably a majority of the inhabitants of

Rome. By 48 B.C. the number had increased to 320,000. It will be seen that the political potentiality of those now receiving relief is no slight one. Add to these the employees who administer relief and do not wish to lose their jobs—they number 9000 in Illinois alone, and of course every one of them is a voter. A newspaper writer, opposed to the administration, stated that the Republicans running for office promised even more relief. To quote:

Every candidate of both parties is doing his quiet best to convince the relief-roll voters that, if elected, they can count him a friend. In many districts "more and bigger relief" has become the undercover candidatorial slogan, and the rivalry is as to which can promise most to the "boys on the relief."

That is exactly what happened in Rome. It is reported that a Democratic circular distributed in North Dakota under the title "The New Deal—What It Has Done for North Dakota" reads: "Our great president has heard our cry for help and has answered it. Will you bite the hand that feeds you?" It is quite likely that those who distributed grain to the Roman populace asked the same question.

The methods used by our legislative bodies and public officials in general strangely remind us of those used by their Roman predecessors. Our officials are fond of taking junketing trips, whether to investigate the cost of inkwells in Patagonia or of haircuts in Tibet. Similar trips were favored by the Romans. During his canvass for the consulship Cicero wrote Atticus that he was planning to take a trip to Cisalpine Gaul, ostensibly as a member of an official commission but actually to further his candidacy. One newspaper opposed to the present government has given prominence to a series of articles describing the many trips taken by government officials at public expense. Perhaps some of its readers are so unsophisticated as not to know that officials of all parties like to travel—at government expense.

So far as I know, no one has ever computed how long it would take to make all the speeches printed in the *Congressional Record* if they had actually been delivered, but I suspect that, if Congress remained in continuous session twenty-four hours a day, there still would not be time for them all. The Romans had no *Congres-*

sional Record. One is tempted to say "Thank goodness," but on second thought we realize that a copy of a Roman *Congressional Record* would be quite as precious as other things found in ancient rubbish heaps. Perhaps 2000 years from now a copy of our *Congressional Record* will be considered as great a find as an empty tin can or a spark plug. But to leave the future to itself and to return to the present and past, we may recall that the Romans, too, revised their speeches before publication. The speeches against Catiline were thus revised. An evidence of this is found in II, 12, where an interruption by one of the audience has been incorporated into the speech. Similarly an interruption by Catiline is worked into I, 20. But a more striking case of revision is the oration in defense of Milo. Milo was on trial for the murder of Clodius, and the latter's followers were in the courtroom when Cicero got up to make his speech for the defense. Cicero made a very poor speech, because he feared the Roman equivalent of a coat of tar and feathers or of lynching. As a result Milo was convicted and went into exile. Cicero afterwards wrote out a very fine speech for Milo, which is still extant, but it brought very little consolation to Milo.

To come more specifically to Cicero's speeches, the earliest (though not the first) with which our students come in contact is the one in favor of the Manilian law, delivered in the year 66. Several comments on modern conditions are suggested by this speech. In section 18 Cicero points out that the foreign investments of Roman citizens are endangered by Mithridates' activity. We may well recall the policy of modern governments, including our own, in behalf of investors. At times we have sent military expeditions to protect their interests; at times we have contented ourselves with diplomatic representations. This has depended somewhat on the size of the country involved. The most recent example is the protest of various countries to Germany on account of her failure to pay interest in full on bonds held by private individuals. Cicero goes on to say that, if the investors are not protected, the same thing will happen that happened before, namely that, when payment of loans was stopped by loss of investments, credit collapsed. This is just as true of domestic as of foreign investments. With the failure of numerous banks, the paralysis of

real estate, the reduction or omission of dividends on account of reduced sales, credit collapsed completely in this country and has not yet been restored in spite of the heroic efforts of the pulmotor (or should we say pull-money?) squads. As Cicero truly remarks, no large number of people can lose money in a nation without dragging many others with them. Even in Cicero's time the financial structure was a delicate and complicated one. Cicero's statement that the collapse of Asiatic investments would be sure to have serious repercussions in Rome applies to present conditions.

The sensitiveness of our grain and stock exchanges to all sorts of political and other influences near and far is shown by the great fluctuations in prices that take place from day to day. Rumors of inflation, the assassination of a king, the speech of a politician, all have their effect. One may well compare these markets to the seismograph, that delicate instrument which records earthquakes in remote regions. That the market was quite as sensitive in ancient times is indicated in Cicero's statement (44) that the day on which Pompey was given the supreme command in the war against the pirates the price of wheat, which had been very high, broke and reached a normal figure. This happened because people were confident that Pompey would quickly put an end to piracy and enable the grain ships to reach the Roman harbor at Ostia.

But the chief point of interest in this speech is the defense of the granting of extraordinary powers to Pompey. This extremely fortunate man, as Cicero calls him, was on the way to becoming a dictator of the Caesar type. He had his chances but for some reason did not take them. The Roman people somehow got into the habit of giving him extraordinary powers. The habit became a fixed one, though the beneficiary changed.

It is, however, the Catilinarian orations that are of most interest to us in finding parallels for modern conditions. Catiline was a man of good family who went into politics like other young men of his class. His personal life was not above reproach, even if he was not the monster that Cicero depicted. His political methods were not essentially different from those of his fellow politicians, though perhaps somewhat more raw. When in the year 66 he felt himself cheated out of the consulship by purely political

charges of extortion, he planned to murder the consuls. Clever politics prevented his running for the consulship in 65. Finally, in 64 Catiline was a candidate at the same time as Cicero.

There is no doubt that Catiline had a large following, whose make-up we shall discuss in a moment. He formed a coalition with Antonius, one of the other candidates, and thus had the support of many of Antonius' friends. Why then was Catiline not elected? The explanation is that Catiline's radical platform and the rumors that he would again resort to violent means alarmed many of the nobles. By various insinuations Cicero cleverly increased their alarm in a campaign speech. Now the nobles were not particularly fond of Cicero. He was a *novus homo*, whereas Catiline was one of themselves; and the nobles jealously guarded the consulship for their own order. Furthermore, Cicero had been a moderate liberal politically and not so conservative as some of the senators could have wished. But when the nobles became frightened about Catiline, they plumped for Cicero as the lesser of two evils. This sort of thing happens over and over again in our politics. A recent example is from the State of Washington. In a primary election the Republicans became so alarmed at the extreme radicalism of one of the two Democratic candidates for senator that they abandoned their own primary and voted for the less radical of the two Democrats. In Pennsylvania Governor Pinchot, though friendly to President Roosevelt's policy, supported the Republican candidate for the Senate on the ground that he was the "least [*sic*] of two evils, the best of a bad bargain."

At any rate, Cicero polled the largest number of votes. Antonius was a poor second and barely defeated Catiline. Cicero now became one of the spokesmen of the conservative party. The radicals began a clever series of political maneuvers intended to put the conservatives and especially Cicero on record or "on the spot." In other words, they were playing the kind of politics that may so often be observed in Congress before an election. First of all, an agrarian law was introduced that Cicero had to oppose. Of the four speeches he made we have one left to us in complete form; in it we see him attacking a popular measure in such a way that he himself may not lose popularity. It is not without interest to

us that Cicero advised the people to stay in Rome where they could enjoy the privilege of voting, the pleasures of the games and festivals, and other "advantages" (*commoda*)—meaning, of course, a listing on the relief roll—rather than to be settled on some sandy or swampy farm. A little later, Titus Labienus, who was to become Caesar's well-remembered lieutenant in Gaul, brought a charge of murder against an old senator, Rabirius, for having taken part in the murder of the popular idol, Saturninus, thirty-seven years before! It is clear that this was a political move and that Julius Caesar, the greatest of all politicians, had a hand in it. Cicero was forced to make a speech in behalf of Rabirius. By these and similar tricks the radicals aroused a good deal of feeling against the conservatives. From that time on Cicero was more or less tied up with the senatorial or conservative party. It is true, however, that he was not an extremist and that he was at times out of patience with the die-hards of his party. He even thought more or less seriously of joining the radical Caesar and abandoning the conservative Pompey.

But let us return to Catiline. In 63 once again he was a candidate for the consulship, and once again he was defeated, chiefly by the clever tactics of Cicero. Then he decided to rally his supporters and to try force.

It is time for us to study the question of Catiline's support in his campaigns and in the conspiracy and to determine what the conspiracy amounted to. Historians have not treated it fairly (apparently because they have not read beneath the surface of Cicero's rhetoric) and have dismissed his supporters rather cavalierly as being men of the basest sort. The clue to an understanding of the movement and of Catiline's support is found in Cicero's second speech, addressed to the people. In the first place it is clear that Cicero is talking to a not too friendly audience. The clever politics played by the radical leaders in the agrarian legislation, in the Rabirius case, and on other occasions had weakened Cicero's popularity. But the really enlightening part of the speech begins with section 17, in which he describes the followers of Catiline and divides them into six classes, the first four of which, be it noted, he wishes to cure of their political illness and to win over

to the state (*placare rei publicae*). Obviously they cannot be the dregs of the populace. The other two classes, consisting of criminals and morally degraded persons, he does not want but urges them to join Catiline.

The first four classes must, therefore, have enjoyed a certain amount of respectability and must have included a large number of people. Let us see who they were, according to Cicero.

First there are the people who own much property, but property that is heavily mortgaged. In other words, they are rich but land-poor. Cicero tells them to sell some of their property rather than lose it all in civil war.

Second come those office-seekers who are heavily in debt. They think that a change of régime might enable them to get government jobs and thus recoup their fortunes.

The third class is made up of two groups of farmers. First come Sulla's veterans, who had received government land. They had lived beyond their means in prosperous times, building houses fit for millionaires, acquiring numerous slaves, indulging in expensive banquets, and they now are head over heels in debt. The second group includes impoverished farmers. Both groups believe that their only hope is in a dictatorship.

The fourth class is a mixture of various elements who have one thing in common: They all owe more money than they can ever pay back.

Now it ought not to take much genius or research for us in our present circumstances to discover what the trouble was. Could a writer today describe our own situation more clearly? In Cicero's list of Catiline's supporters we find rich men with fine city homes for their own use and perhaps other property bought as an investment. Are these men the scum of the earth? Not any more so than many people of the same class living—or committing suicide—today. Cicero is a little disingenuous in advising them to sell some of their property to save the rest, for there was no market for city real estate or farm land then any more than there is now. Cicero himself in a speech made a few months earlier⁴ says that those

⁴ *On the Agrarian Law* ii, 68.

holding land distributed by Sulla can find no buyers and would jump at the chance to sell to the government.

Another class consists of war veterans and farmers—no riffraff there. All four classes owe money.

It is hardly necessary after this enumeration to state in so many words what the trouble was and what solution Catiline offered. Anyone who reads the newspapers can guess. Economic conditions had become steadily worse for many years. Everyone was in debt. Four years earlier a bill to restrict foreign loans had been passed. We may recall the restrictions placed on the sale of foreign bonds in this country not long ago.

During Cicero's consulship the situation became so bad that a panic flared up. Loans were called, and gold flowed out of the country. The consuls, by authority of the senate, declared an embargo on gold and silver exports. This is exactly what has happened in our country.

When loans were called people could not raise cash; for the bottom had dropped out of the real estate and other markets. In this situation a certain Considius, a very rich banker and investor, helped restore confidence by declaring a moratorium on both the principal and interest due him.⁵ That is just what many creditors are doing today.

Catiline's proposal was a simple one: *tabulae novae*, cancellation or reduction of debts. This was not an unheard-of proposal. In 86 B.C., during the hard times and panic resulting from the Social War and the loss to Mithridates of Asia and the money invested there, creditors were forced to accept 25 per cent of their loans in full payment thereof. In 91 B.C. there was inflation by debasing the currency, and of course inflation meant a reduction of debt. Later on, in 49 B.C., during the Civil War, when all credit had disappeared, when investors were afraid to invest their funds, and when debtors would not pay their debts, debtors were asked to turn over their property to government officials for appraisal on a pre-war basis, and the creditors were forced to accept a scaling down on that basis if they wanted immediate payment. The average scaling down was 25 per cent. Anti-hoarding regulations

⁵ Val. Max. iv, viii, 3.

were also put into effect. All this, of course, recalls our own inflation, brought about by going off the gold standard, our anti-hoarding law, our moratorium on farm mortgages, our HOLC, with its attempt to scale down mortgage interest, our facilitation of bankruptcy, our refinancing of mortgage bonds, and our other methods for reducing private debts. Catiline would be quite at home in present-day America. It may be added that as early as 352 B.C. Rome had a Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Keeping in mind what I have just said about Catiline's support, the reader will see the importance of at least part of Cicero's second speech against Catiline. Over and over again I have heard teachers say: "Omit the second oration, as it is largely repetition of the first." Such a statement proves how little the teacher has thought about the real significance of Cicero's words. I say, "Omit all the rest of the Catilinarian speeches, if you must, but, for Parallel's sake, save those three precious chapters of the second oration which describe the six classes of conspirators. They are the key to the conspiracy."

Our present national problem is far from simple, and there is no single right solution for it. Unquestionably some device for reducing private debts is as necessary now as in 63 and 49 B.C. Unquestionably, too, many persons today deserve relief from their debts, just as some of Catiline's followers did. But there is another side to the picture: Many people have lost their desire to work and their sense of responsibility for debts contracted. The alarming thing is that people who have always been scrupulous about paying their lawful debts have been driven by circumstances and by the example of others to take this view. For such persons Cicero has an excellent message in his essay on duty. After objecting to Caesar's moratorium on the payment of house rent he adds:⁶

And what is the meaning of an abolition of debts, except that you buy a farm with my money; that you have the farm, and I have not my money?

We must, therefore, take measures that there shall be no indebtedness of a nature to endanger the public safety. It is a menace that can be averted in many ways; but should a serious debt be incurred, we are not to allow the rich to lose their property, while the debtors profit by what is their neighbour's. For there is nothing that upholds a government more powerfully than

⁶ *Off. II*, 84, tr. Walter Miller, in the Loeb Classical Library.

its credit; and it can have no credit, unless the payment of debts is enforced by law. Never were measures for the repudiation of debts more strenuously agitated than in my consulship. Men of every sort and rank attempted with arms and armies to force the project through. But I opposed them with such energy that this plague was wholly eradicated from the body politic. Indebtedness was never greater; debts were never liquidated more easily or more fully; for the hope of defrauding the creditor was cut off, and payment was enforced by law.

Many people today tell us that capitalism is dead, that the world can no longer survive under a capitalistic system. No doubt many persons had the same feeling in 63 and 49 B.C. and at many other periods of the world's history—yet capitalism has survived. There is no reason, I believe, why it should not survive in the future if we want it to. That, in my opinion, is one lesson that history can teach us.

Cicero repeatedly called Catiline *hostis*, a public enemy, who had forfeited all his rights and could be dealt with summarily. We are reminded of the attitude of the present German government. General Goering is quoted as saying:

Whoever by his conduct puts himself beyond the pale and opposes the community and tries to destroy it—that person also puts himself beyond the laws of the community and loses his right to the protection of the community.

Cicero discovered to his cost that not everyone agreed with him and that the processes of law had to be carried out. Whether the present German rulers will have the same experience remains to be seen.

In the course of this paper I have called Caesar a radical. Such he was from his early years, apparently for political reasons, although, like other leading radicals, such as Catiline, he belonged to a senatorial family. He counseled against putting the conspirators to death and was even charged with participation in the conspiracy of Catiline. In any case he was consistently a member and leader of the party that demanded reforms in the interest of the proletariat. It was, then, a radical leader who became dictator of Rome and founder of the Roman Empire. In the same way today Mussolini began life as a socialist, and many socialistic ideas are incorporated in the fascist state. In Germany the dictator is head

of the National Socialist party and won his early successes on a platform of radical and socialistic ideas that attracted the workingman and the poorer classes in general. He promised that large estates should be confiscated and divided, exactly as the radicals did in Rome, and he assured the debt-ridden that interest would be abolished, just as Catiline did. In Russia we see a dictatorship of another type growing out of ultra-radical ideas. In the United States the enemies of the present government have not been slow to point out that the radical policies of the government are leading to dictatorship, that in fact one has already been initiated as a consequence of the extraordinary powers given the president by Congress. The parallel hunters may wish to point out that Caesar belonged to an old senatorial or noble family that would ordinarily be conservative, and that, in contrast to Mussolini and Hitler, President Roosevelt belongs to a family of the same sort. It might be added that the members of the Caesar family, like the Roosevelts, were divided in their political views. I need hardly add that a radical leadership does not always lead to dictatorship, nor are all dictators of popular origin. Since penning these thoughts I have seen Oswald Spengler quoted as saying that President Roosevelt is either America's "first Caesar or a sort of St. John the Baptist who comes to make ready the way for the ruler."

With the establishment of dictatorship the power of parliaments wanes. This is not, it must be admitted, an unmitigated evil, when we think of some of the actions and antics of past Congresses. In Italy the old parliamentary organization has been abandoned. In Germany it has become the puppet of the dictator. The same thing happened to the Roman senate from the time of Caesar on. To be sure, the senate had for centuries usurped powers and to some extent it merely lost that to which it had no legal claim except by a species of squatter's rights. An occasional emperor tried to restore to the senators a little feeling of their former importance without, however, releasing his own grasp on the helm of state. It is no wonder, then, that the more realistic of the senators felt that they were merely rubber stamps. Thus in the time of Pliny certain senators wrote scurrilous jokes on the ballots instead of the names of candidates. They probably realized that

the office they held was a joke and treated it accordingly. Pliny's indignation at their action strikes one as a bit absurd. But Pliny always took himself too seriously.

In bringing these random thoughts to a close I must anticipate one objection, that there is danger of introducing partisanship into the classroom and that there is danger, for the teacher, in so doing. But that is not a necessary result. I recall that in my first paper I challenged my audience to discover what my own political beliefs were. I repeat the challenge.

AN ENGLISH TEACHER USES HIS LATIN¹

By VIRGIL K. WHITAKER

Stanford University

In discussing the subject "An English Teacher Uses his Latin," I shall make no pretense to originality. After all, the subject is one upon which true originality is somewhat difficult. Perhaps, however, an analysis by an English teacher of the use that he has made of his slight store of Latin during the past year may be of some interest to teachers of Latin. In that hope I shall offer this case study, as it might be called, confining myself to two simple and hackneyed subjects: first, Latin as it aided, or might have aided, my students; and second, Latin as it offered me material to use in presenting composition and literature.

That most students do not know how to read has become a truism. They spend countless hours gazing at a few pages and yet emerge with no clear understanding of the contents of those pages. For this situation they are undoubtedly themselves partially at fault, but I came to believe that the very character of the English language must also share the blame. Latinists have stressed unceasingly the value of Latin to the student in mastering new words as he confronts them, and I shall therefore not dwell on my use of it in this connection. The problem seems to me a broader one. As I worked with classes to whom Latin was almost unknown, it occurred to me that, as regards the English language, the Latinist and the non-Latinist move in entirely different worlds—so different, in fact, that the one individual has no conception of the mental processes of the other. As far as the Romance part of the English vocabulary goes, the average student moves in a mental fog. Even

¹ A condensed version of a paper read before the Classical Section of the Regional Meeting of the Washington Educational Association held in Spokane, October 15 and 16, 1934. The teaching discussed was done at Whitworth College, Spokane.

though he may have met some of the words in childhood, he has only a vague and blurred idea of what they mean; he finds a clear and focused image beyond his powers. If the matter that he is reading is commonplace and general, he is fairly safe; but let the book begin to deal in complicated ideas and nice distinctions and he is either slowed down or stopped altogether.

But may not his hazy and generalized vocabulary be the source of hazy and generalized thinking? The individual who becomes accustomed to accepting uncomprehended words and sentences and, therefore, imperfectly understood paragraphs and books may never learn to demand that everything he reads make clear sense—may, in fact, never come to know what clear sense is. I am convinced that such is the case, even though a Latinic vocabulary is sometimes not directly involved in the given passage. I remember reading with a class some of Shakespeare's sonnets and noting how completely the members failed to realize the full implication of what Shakespeare said. The more complicated sonnets (no. 116, for example) simply eluded their comprehension. But what distressed me most was the fact that the students were willing to read a sonnet, call it "nice" poetry, and be in no way moved by its failure to mean anything to them. In fact, they apparently did not realize that it should convey some definite idea. They had become acclimated to their mental fog.

I therefore hoped, as I laboriously explained exactly what hundreds of words meant and what force they gave to specific passages, that I was not only drilling the students in vocabulary but also giving them a new conception of concreteness and accuracy of thought.

The connection with Latin of what I have been saying is one degree removed, but the mention of Shakespeare's sonnets brings me to another use of Latin that is direct and immediate; I mean its use as a key to the older English classics. Fortunately for the reader of Latin, the countless changes in the meanings of words have almost uniformly been away from the original significance. Consequently, to words of Romance origin he need only apply his Latin; and, fortunately for him, it is for the most part the Latinic words that have shifted in meaning. A few examples will illustrate what I mean.

Suppose a college freshman should undertake to read *The Courtier* by Baldassare Castiglione in the Elizabethan translation by Sir Thomas Hoby and should be told that the courtier must not be "curious in dress." He would probably go ahead without bothering to find out what was involved, and he might write on his next examination that no courtier should try to find out what other people wore. But if he knew Latin, he ought immediately to reflect that *cur* means "care" and the suffix *os* means "full of." If he knew Horace, he might think of the famous phrase *curiosa felicitas*. At any rate, he would translate the word into modern English as "careful"; and remembering the rule of semantics that words often pursue a pejorative development in meaning, he would deduce that Hoby meant "too careful"—and he would be exactly right.

Or consider the plight of the poor student confronted with Ben Jonson's statement in *Timber, or Discoveries*, that Bacon, as an orator, "had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion"! And, by the way, only a good Latinist would recognize that the title *Timber* is Jonson's quaint translation of *silvae*, the regular word for miscellany.

I have indicated what the Latin student *ought* to do in such cases. The disappointment is that very often he cannot do so, largely because he does not know how to handle Latin word formation. It seems to me that more time might well be spent in teaching Latin classes how Latin words are put together—how different parts of speech are built one upon another and how prefixes and suffixes are used. For example, very few of my college students could trace the steps in the relationship between the Latin *vivere* and the English *victuals*. Yet such knowledge is what they most need in applying their study of Latin to the English vocabulary.

I have already, I fear, dwelt far too long on what I might call the philological aspect of my subject. It is high time that I turned to the aid that I myself have derived from Latin in preparing myself to teach English. But before I proceed to literature, I should mention my indebtedness for the principles of organization and of approach that I use in teaching expository writing. The general principles of organization that the ancient rhetoricians laid down

are, of course, those which should occur to any intelligent person; but it is useful to find them set forth with the usual classical clarity and precision and thus to avoid the process of trial and error. The rhetoricians had, moreover, worked out suggestions for introductory approaches, devices for knitting the exposition together, and types of conclusions that a modern writer finds helpful. Modern teachers of advanced composition might still, I think, study Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian with profit. At any rate, I find myself constantly using their ideas as a point of departure in teaching both organization and actual writing, and a thorough reading of such writers is one of my own immediate objectives.

As a teacher of English I am, however, interested primarily in literature, and as an individual with a personal taste I am interested primarily in the literature of the Elizabethan age. For the study of that age Latin is, of course, indispensable; and I shall endeavor to suggest some of the helps given to me by Latin and its inevitable associate, Greek, in the interpretation of Renaissance literature.

Most obvious of all is, of course, the matter of allusions. The writers of the Tudor era doted on tags of classical learning; and a study of Latin helps one sometimes to recognize the beasts, men, and gods that they were so fond of using for purposes of simile, metaphor, or, I sometimes think, from sheer orneriness. Unfortunately such Renaissance favorites as Ovid, Suetonius, Quintilian, and especially Seneca are now little read; and further to perplex the modern student, the Elizabethans were fond of passing choice and far-fetched quotations and allusions from writer to writer. They were, in fact, much fonder of displaying choice lines in quotation than of understanding the general intention of a classic author. The modern Latinist should, therefore, not expect to recognize all allusions and quotations, but neither should he be overly awed by the seemingly infinite knowledge of those whom he is reading.

A less obvious use of Latin in the Renaissance was the harping on conventional literary themes derived from classical sources. The pastoral convention, most familiar in Milton's *Lycidas* but present in the majority of Renaissance writers and derived ul-

timately from Theocritus and Vergil, is the most obvious example. But there are many others that sometimes lead the unwary and unclassical astray. The convention (well known to readers of Horace) by which poetry was assumed to be "more enduring than bronze" became in the Elizabethan age simply a means of increasing the extravagance of the compliment offered by the poet to his patron or his beloved. It has no meaning as an expression of the poet's own conviction about himself, as I once pointed out to a student who undertook to show by a few such lines from the sonnets that Shakespeare thoroughly appreciated his own greatness. To mention another example, we are all familiar with countless Elizabethan lyrics that express a longing for the simple life. The best known is perhaps Surrey's

*Martial, the things that do attain
The happy life be these, I find.*

But this poem is simply a paraphrase of an epigram by Martial; and it is very unlikely that any of these pieces embodies a genuine desire to leave the court of the Virgin Queen in pursuit of the simple life. The poets were merely reëchoing Horace and Martial.

There were also other conventional ideas in regard to literature in general that differed from ours. For example, the Renaissance, following ancient practice, made no such distinction as we do between types of subject-matter proper for poetry and prose. If Empedocles and Lucretius could versify on philosophy and natural science, Phineas Fletcher saw no objection to writing *The Purple Island*, a discussion of anatomy and related subjects, in Spenserian stanzas; and there are several scientific encyclopaedias of the period in verse. In much the same fashion the Renaissance adopted the belief of Greece that the dramatist was a moral teacher and that all poetry was a "criticism of life." Consequently, when the Puritans attacked the drama, its defenders never thought of arguing that it gave legitimate pleasure but rather maintained the somewhat dubious position that it improved public morals by showing the horribleness of vice.

The English teacher does not deal, however, only with isolated

conventions and "movements"; he deals also with literature as an art. Literature has generally been the presentation of the writer's conceptions in certain conventional forms according to accepted principles of composition, and these conventions and principles of literary art must be presented to students. During the past year I have found it necessary twice to reread Aristotle's *Poetics*, upon which rests all literary criticism that is not purely impressionistic, and to review Horace's *Art of Poetry*. Seneca is also important in his own way, since the Elizabethan drama, as far as it is classical in inspiration, derives from him rather than from the Greek. I might add that my own conception of the application of dramatic canons to the study of a specific play dates from the time that I undertook to analyze the *Alcestis* of Euripides.

I have, however, found the dramatic principles useful outside the Elizabethan age in a far wider field than the drama. For the interpretation of the novel there exists no conventional point of departure. It is so much easier to get students to remember when a given novel was written than to develop in them a power to analyze the work to see why it is good and what is to be got out of it. Yet it is surely the latter that is of permanent value. I sometimes think, therefore, that we need a modern Aristotle to clarify our ideas. Lacking such, I fall back upon the dramatic principles just mentioned and use them both in class and as the basis of my own thinking.

Then finally, I have found my Latin of most interest and value of all in my study of what the Elizabethan man was—what he really thought about himself and about the world in which he lived, what motives governed his actions. Shakespeare saw a world that seemed to him fundamentally different from the world that we see, and he conceived of his neighbors and the characters in his plays in thought patterns that are utterly foreign to our experience. Yet, if we are to understand what he wrote, we must strive to see things as he saw them. We must, in short, reproduce his store of knowledge.

The books in which the men of Shakespeare's day incorporated their technical discussions and in which they embodied the learn-

ing that was the basis of their thinking and living were written not in English but in Renaissance Latin; and many of my most interesting hours have been devoted to the reading of just such works. Not merely did I get an inkling of strange notions in the realm of natural science, but I uncovered elaborate systems of ethics and psychology, perhaps more comprehensive and better known to those people than are ours to us. There were, moreover, other lines of thought that we no longer dream of, taken just as seriously as those which we still allow. For example, magic, demonology, astrology, and alchemy seemed as legitimate branches of knowledge as law or mathematics; and traces of them are to be found on almost every page of Elizabethan literature. Elaborate and widely accepted misinterpretations of *Hamlet* have been built on the failure to understand that the ghost must have been either a good angel or a demon from hell masquerading as the father and that the latter, since it was in accord with a normal means employed by the Devil to lure souls to hell, would have seemed to the original audience the more likely possibility. Hamlet, far from being the thoughtful man incapable of action described by nineteenth-century critics, was therefore merely displaying ordinary prudence in making sure that the ghost spoke the truth. Or when Shakespeare speaks of love as "the star to every wandering bark, whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken," he implies by "height" the astronomical calculation of the position of the ship at sea and by "worth" the astrological determination of the influence of the star upon mankind; and to an Elizabethan the "worth" seemed as scientific as the "height." Others besides Ben Jonson in the *Alchemist* attacked the scientific quacks of the period, but few denied that there were also legitimate practitioners of these same "sciences."

Some of the most interesting work that is being done by students of English literature today is directed toward an understanding of Renaissance thought as a basis for the criticism of Renaissance literature. As I have intimated, only he who reads Latin can pass beyond the threshold, for Latin is the language of the Renaissance. Yet to many Latin teachers this fascinating realm seems to be

unknown. What little such work I myself have done I have found of constant use and pleasure, and I hope some day to penetrate beyond the threshold at least into the outer chamber.

I am quite well aware, as I finish, that I have fulfilled my promise in that I have not said anything original. If this superficial discussion has, however, brought into some clear focus the uses that I have made of Latin in connection with one period of English literature, I shall be content.

THE EVOLVING LATIN COURSE

By MILDRED DEAN
Roosevelt High School
Washington, D. C.

The ancient castle of the Latin course is being robbed of the cliffs upon which it once rested. Or perhaps we might make a more accurate comparison if we said that our old Latin course was the furnace in which were fused into a real education the various kinds of information acquired in the graded schools. But one by one the things that used to be taught in the elementary schools are being eliminated. Grammar, line and name geography, word analysis, mythology, all have retired into the world of forgotten things.

For we are witnessing a change in elementary school methods that causes an entire alteration in the equipment with which a child enters the eighth or ninth grade. This change has been deliberate, purposeful, reasoned, determined. It has been caused by the findings of the alienists of the country during their studies of the growth of the nervous system. Under the guidance of the psychiatrists educational leaders during the last decade have engineered a radical reorganization that has just begun its fruition. Their contention is that fear and pressure must be banished from the classroom; that everything the child does must be his choice at that moment; that, in order that they may be understood later, there must be no memorizing of things not understood in the vain hope that they will become clear later; that by happy activity the child learns; that we must lead and shape the natural impulses of the child so that he wishes to learn and does learn.

The authority of these directions, based as it is on physiological studies, has swept the elementary schools along. All the things that take place in a grade school today are totally different from what they were ten years ago. When the three R's would interfere

with the program of a grade, the three R's are allowed to fall into innocuous desuetude. Needless to say, ail grammar preceded them into that limbo long ago.

In short, it is as if the north pole had been moved! There is no regress. Our movement is as irretrievable as the descent to Avernus. It is the *inremeabilis unda* which we have crossed. We must stop repining and complaining. There is no place for rage. We must adopt Spinoza's words: "I have striven not to mock, not to lament, not to execrate the deeds of men; I have striven to understand them." We must understand the schools of today, to see first if it is possible to teach Latin under the circumstances and second what readjustments we must make to carry on.

If by teaching Latin we mean getting our pupils to achieve power enough to translate unsimplified Caesar in the last nine weeks of the tenth grade, with fair prospects of dealing with Cicero and Vergil in turn, then unquestionably we *can* teach Latin under present circumstances. But if we mean finishing two declensions and three tenses of the active indicative of two conjugations within the first fifteen lessons of a beginners' book (about six weeks), then unquestionably we cannot teach Latin under the present conditions. In other words the effort for the latter program leaves us only empty seats at the end of our first marking period. In several different places in the country a course in Latin is evolving within the framework defined in the Classical Investigation Report. All who are concerned with the classics should note this course and give practical suggestions for its growth.

In Washington we begin with large groups of children in the eighth grade, many of them entirely unsuitable material for Latin students. They are taught the fundamentals of a sentence and the technical grammar that belongs to those concepts while they deal with extremely simple Latin and while their work is diversified by many interesting studies of Roman life, the geography of the ancient world, and stories about famous Romans. In the two semesters of that grade the actual form work mastered includes only two declensions, four tenses of the active voice of four conjugations, the pronouns *is* and *qui*. Pupils learn a technical grammar vocabulary of about fifty words. When we remember that these

pupils did not clearly realize the difference between noun and verb when they began Latin and had never heard the technical meaning of voice, person, number, plural, object, and twenty or thirty other terms as common and necessary, we can see that they have gained a great deal of valuable information. At the end of the eighth-grade course we persuade into other electives the ones who seem too unsuited to a language course, and we carry on the remainder of the group.

What are the readjustments that can be made so that we can give valuable experiences even to the ones who will not go beyond one year of Latin, while we also prepare the way for the future of the other pupils? Let us see what needs the child has at that period that Latin can supply. First of all there is the need for better enunciation. No practice has been given to the child in stretching the muscles of his throat, lips, and jaws; his tongue is in more senses than one an unruly member. No one has helped the children to associate definite sounds with definite letters or the sound of a word with the separate sounds of the letters in that word. It used to be done in the lower grades in reading. But Latin is a far better vehicle for teaching it. The simplicity of the spelling and the exactness and regularity of the sounds of the letters afford us an unrivaled tool for giving real instruction in clearness of speech. Of course the children are interested in this side of their work. Noting neighborhood faults, in order to avoid them, and clarifying speech, to gain a chance to broadcast—these things help the child to begin work upon his own education. Greetings and simple little remarks about the weather begin the oral work in the eighth grade. Within three or four weeks the little questions and answers involve the grammatical principles we are learning, and actual use of the constructions leads on in due time to the technical names. Many of the older teachers are timid about trying this phase of our work. But a good bulletin of questions and answers to study and a very little nerve will start them off on a career that will bring a new joy into their teaching. Practicing the sounds of the long and short vowels and noting the use of the same sounds in English words that are frequently mispronounced is a profitable experience for all of us lazy-tongued Americans.

Next, the ability to pick out parts of words used to be one of the things we could count upon in our beginning Latin classes. But word analysis has been entirely banished from the elementary school in spite of its great value. Many of our modern textbooks in Latin give us excellent material in this field, but it must be approached as entirely new to the pupils and made so definite that there is no escape from the points presented; for example, unless you write *novus* beneath "renovate" and underscore the letters *nov*, you will not get the connection established even in a brilliant class of beginners, so utterly unaccustomed are they to any kind of analysis. In general our texts furnish us with more than enough for this side of our work.

The third point is much more in line with the real substance of a Latin course, but it, too, must be approached with the most determined effort to see that the points hit their target. The relation of one word to others in the sentence is the basic idea, one might say, in language study. Yet these children arrive in a Latin classroom scarcely conscious that a sentence is made up of words or that words are of different kinds or that words can have an effect upon each other. The phrase "part of speech" is unknown to them. Of technical grammatical terms they are totally ignorant. This is the most difficult thing for a Latin teacher to grasp. Equally difficult is it to realize that a month, even a semester, of careful teaching of the names of the parts of speech leaves the children still very uncertain in using the terms. Long after they have ceased to attach verb endings to nouns, they will hesitate to name the part of speech. Until we remember that our former pupils used to begin their grammar work in the fourth grade and had regular lessons in it from that time on, we shall not be able to see why it takes so long to build up even a small grammar vocabulary.

Beside these three lines of work which will be useful even to those who are to be in Latin classes only one year there is the store of information about Roman life that contrasts so clearly with our own civilization. Where could be found a better illustration of life dominated by scarcity to set beside our own possibilities of life dominated by abundance? All of these things are fruitful also for pupils who can be successful in the course later on.

The most important of all our readjustments, however, is more a question of the teacher's attitude and method. It is the elimination of memorization and recitation as the daily routine of the class. Mastery of the forms must, of course, be achieved, but memorization in the modern school comes by use. The curse of our course in the past has been the memorizing of things not understood at the time and used blindly without real comprehension. This kind of work is useless as training. It produces no change in the pupil's ideas, gives him no new springs of action. When our course of study was designed, the pupils came to it with a mature understanding of their own language, and their work in Latin grammar was a sort of swift epitomizing of what they already knew in English. As English grammar became less and less in quantity in the schools, whole sections of our work should have been recast in order to become comprehensible to our students. We did not recast it. Our work developed more and more dead spots, which we inflicted upon our students by mere will. All this unprofitable matter, unprofitable because not understood, was perfectly useless and ineffective in training the child. It did not do for him at all what we expected and loudly claimed. It was not in any sense a part of him. It was merely something strapped on. Of course it had no effect on his thinking or his other work. It is this dead husk of the organization of our material for which some of us are still proudly fighting. It is this dead husk that is displayed in classes where the formula is, "Learn this tonight, and recite it to me tomorrow."

The classes where Latin is really living are conducted upon a far different principle. There is no absence of definite tasks to do at night, there is regularity, exactness, and the habit of dealing with things that require constructive thinking. Checking up on prepared work is done quickly, by little tests, or by answering pupils' questions before home work reports are passed in. The larger part of class time is spent working ahead into new fields. A new story uses some new form or construction so naturally and logically that it is understood before it is seen to be strange. Then it is practiced and noted for study. The work is real and practical to the children, they use it as their own, and consequently they

take it into every other class and bring facts from every other subject into their Latin class. Perceptible changes in their thinking and acting occur.

The ninth-grade work in our reorganized course brings us to the traditional point of preparation for the tenth grade.¹ At this juncture perhaps you point out that we have spent two years achieving what we used to do not quite so well in one. My answer to that is that we have included in our course all that used to be prepared for us ahead of time, some mythology, some line geography of the Mediterranean, some hero stories from old Rome, a basic vocabulary for grammar, some skill in analyzing words, and the habit of doing patiently and regularly every night a task not beyond the pupil's comprehension but something that he himself recognizes as a proper and interesting problem. All this foundation we have had to build for ourselves.

The tenth grade still remains a stumbling block, although its content as laid down in the Classical Investigation Report is logical and entirely practicable. The difficulty lies largely with the obsolete form of the College Entrance Examination Board comprehensive examination, designed to come at the end of Caesar to secure two credits for college entrance. Many teachers are drawn aside from the logical development of our course into the complicated grammatical analyses and the mastery drills for forms of not very common occurrence, which are demanded by this test. The reading program for the year is sacrificed for technicalities that do not aid in the better comprehension of Cicero and that bore and drive out of our classes many pupils who enjoyed Latin and would have made successful Cicero and Vergil students. These technicalities are the "dead spots," useless to the pupils because beyond their grammatical experience.

The cure for this situation is the alteration of the Comprehensive 2 (Cp 2). It should contain sight translation of narrative Latin into English and a narrative paragraph to be translated into Latin. All explanations of constructions should be eliminated, and all testing on forms should also be omitted. It should be a

¹ A standardized test given in October, 1933, to the tenth grade showed in pupils thus prepared comprehension of Latin far above the national norms.

purely functional test. If that type of test is suitable for the end of the Cicero year and the Vergil year, why is it not suitable also for the end of the Caesar year? Models of such an examination are found in the Oxford Smalls, which are tests given to those who did not pass the original examinations. They contain syntax of the level recorded for the tenth grade in Lee Byrne's syntax count and are entirely functional in character.

Do we value Latin as an educational medium? Do we consider it a vitally necessary part of the training of the youth of our country? Are we, its custodians, so convinced of its value that we will carry it through in altered arrangement if necessary? Or do we cry, "It shall be done just as it always was or not at all!" Does it train in that united effort so necessary in civilization, or is disharmony one of its products? Does it unite all the *disiecta membra* of science, history, and other languages into a harmonious whole of understanding by the magic of words? Or does it foster narrowness that knows only one way to achieve an end and prefers destruction to any change? The time has come for us to look at ourselves to see what is the value of a classical training. If we can be dauntless, resourceful, patient, determined, fervent in the preservation and enrichment of our Latin courses instead of bent exclusively upon our own specialty, we can keep Latin in the schools as an elective. And by sincerely utilizing in profitable experiences for our pupils every moment of our preparatory school time, we can within a few years make our students so distinctly better than non-Latin students in all their academic work that the world will once again look upon Latin as the incomparable educational material.

THE MODERNITY OF ARISTOTLE'S *ETHICS*

By L. R. LIND
Wabash College

Although as a handbook of conduct adapted to the moral needs of a high civilization the *Nichomachean Ethics* of Aristotle has not been surpassed, its validity for times later than those in which it was written both deserves and requires a renewed emphasis. It is certainly clear that Cicero's *De Officiis* is based too largely on mere expedience, that the *New Testament* is too visionary, the *Ethics* of Spinoza too difficult and concentrated, the *Letters* of Lord Chesterfield too superficial to fill quite the position held by Aristotle's *Ethics*.

Perhaps the first reason for the appeal that his general views on conduct should possess for the modern world is their extremely practical nature, lifted at the same time above the level of mere practicality by a profoundly philosophical grasp of man's true function in society. Among all books on the same theme it is the least transcendental, that is, if we except its theory of the *vita contemplativa*. It is here that the modern man bogs down in reading the *Ethics*; and there is no doubt that it is to many a disconcerting and inharmonious departure from reality in a discourse to which, in other respects, most men can give hearty approval. Yet the ideal of the contemplative life does not seem to me the keystone of the *Ethics*; although apparently Aristotle's entire series of discussions upon happiness, goodness, courage, temperance, justice, goodness of intellect, weakness of will, friendship, and the good for man leads to this crowning conclusion, it is the only transcendental element that can rightly be called such in the *Ethics*. Furthermore, it occupies only a small part of one book, the tenth; and Aristotle goes on from it to more practical things. It is possible that this brief aspect of the *Ethics* has, in the dim light of Christian morality, been emphasized beyond its due proportions; it is also a

Platonic remnant¹ in Aristotle's later philosophy of human conduct, receiving its justification rather from religious belief than from the carefully logical argument to which it is the ostensible conclusion. I confess that I have always thought of the "contemplative life" in association with Homer's airy phrase about the "gods who live at ease"; surely Homer and Aristotle did not regard a retirement from life as the greatest good; there is nothing monastic about either of them. Aristotle's own life shows that he did not spend all his time in contemplation; he was a man of affairs, a busy scientist, an analyst of the political and social order, the first of psychologists, and an energetic traveler and research worker in the interests of all learning. Happiness, "the good for man," which is the central point of his ethical thought, was for him "an *activity* in accordance with virtue,"² an idea running through the entire *Ethics*; and a contemplative exercise of the intelligence the gods gave men to be the divine principle in them (*voûs*) is closer to the temper of the man than such a vague, quietistic, monastical doctrine as that of the "contemplative life." Like Bacon and Goethe after him, he would have turned away from mere contemplation into the life of action, without any sentimental nostalgia for the calm introspective existence adumbrated in Book x.

¹ This statement is corroborated by Werner Jaeger in his brilliant study of the development of Aristotle's thought, *Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung*: Berlin, Weidmann (1923). The *Ethics* represents a break with Plato's one-sided, theoretical conception of society as something amenable to expression in mathematical terms, a view that controls the earlier *Protrepticus* of Aristotle. In the *Ethics*, "the first real phenomenology of morals" (p. 86), the study of society is approached from a realistic and psychological, not a mathematical or aesthetic, point of view; practical examples are used throughout as illustrations, and it is with the empirical method of the carpenter, not the theoretical one of the geometrician, that Aristotle compares his ethico-political science (p. 87; cf. *Eth. Nic.* x, ix, 18 f. [1181a]; i, xiii, 7 [1102a]). See also page 98 and pages 237-270, "Die Urethik," on the relation of the *Protrepticus* and the *Eudemian* to the *Nichomachean Ethics*. The *βλος θεωρητικός* in Book x is very small potatoes, indeed, in comparison with the Eudemian view of ethics as "rein Gottesdienst"; see page 424: "Die Stellung des *βλος θεωρητικός* am Ende der Ethik bedeutet jetzt nicht mehr, dass aller irdische Wandel theologisiert werden soll, sondern dass es über der praktisch-ethischen Welt noch eine höhere gibt." Whether, however, this higher world is also that of Plato's ideas is hard to say. Apparently the ideal of the contemplative life goes back beyond Plato to Pythagoras himself (p. 99); see *Eth. Nic.* ii, x, vi, 14 (1106b), for the Pythagorean doctrine of the boundless nature of evil.

² i, vii, 15 (1098a); x, viii, 10 (1179a).

It is true that Socrates, through whose great pupil Aristotle was influenced even in the latest stages of his thought, advocated a withdrawal from public life; but he did so on purely personal grounds, impressed by the conviction that his ideas would bring him to disaster in the world of practical politics. While realizing the impossibility of teaching virtue to the masses³ and the futility of reform without resorting to violence, Aristotle knew that making men better involves action for good among them and counseled those who wished to improve men to become lawmakers, "if through laws we may become good."⁴ The art of politics has, like the art of medicine, the function of healing, and scientific realism should be a characteristic of both. The value of experience in dealing with sociological problems is emphasized again and again, without the ironical twist Socrates gave to so many of his illustrations drawn from empirical knowledge; "books do not make a doctor,"⁵ it is true, but Aristotle does not because of that fact sneer at the doctor's knowledge. "Each one makes best judgment of those things which he knows, and of these things he is a good judge."⁶

The ideal of happiness for the greatest number, which the art of politics seeks to attain, is an entirely practical and workable one. It presumes, of course, a considerable body of men working unselfishly toward a noble end; and it is worthy of notice to what extent Aristotle presupposes a good deal of idealistic social responsibility on the part of those who are to govern the commonwealth. If he could expect a very high level, indeed, of gentlemanly and humane conduct from his leaders of the people in an age entirely innocent of foundations for the promotion of charity and sanitation, without all the paraphernalia for social betterment we have today, including the Salvation Army, the dole, the bread-line, and the NRA, what should we expect of our leaders? The answer is obvious but disappointing.

The passage on the liberal man has a rare significance for us in this connection. First of all, the ruling classes of Athens were, by assumption, *ἐλευθέριοι* as well as *ἐλεύθεροι*; to them applies with

³ x, x, 1-8 (1179b).

⁵ x, x, 21 (1181b).

⁴ x, x, 17 (1180b).

⁶ i, i, 5 (1094b).

peculiar fitness the entire discussion of liberality in Book IV. Now the liberal man gives of his goods to other people not as a matter of honor or of self-seeking but as something necessarily taken for granted, and thus, three hundred years before Christ, he renders proper charity; it is by the *ἔξω* of giving, by the habit acquired with experience, that the liberal man is known.⁷ The crafty *quid pro quo* of a ward boss doling out cigars and baseball tickets or of a millionaire endowing universities and museums falls miserably short of such a grace as Aristotle by implication gave cause to expect from an entire class of Athenian society. This is certainly a rather searching comment upon the difference between ancient Athens and the modern world.

With the acquisition of virtue and correct education in gaining pleasure and pain from the right things the discussion of the formation of habit in Book II has a close connection. The ideal of the mean gave men a norm by which to choose not only the middle path between profligacy and insensibility, prodigality and stinginess, buffoonery and boorishness, bashfulness and shamelessness, directing them toward temperance, liberality, wittiness, and modesty; it gave them the clue by which they could avoid exactly the same, though not the most serious, ills that afflict a modern capitalistic society—*βαναυσία* and *ἀπειροκαλία*, vulgar profusion and lack of taste.

The doctrine of the mean has been discounted by some as a platitude of the most banal sort; but one would go far to find a clearer and more useful statement of what is intended to be a working, rule-of-thumb system of making moral choices. The means and extremes of conduct dealt with here are so vividly personified in the great-souled man, the somewhat foolishly affable average man (*εὐτράπελος*, a man of an easy turn of mind), the boor, and the prodigal, that even the parables of Christ are not more practical. Teaching by both precept and example is strengthened here by expanded illustration. True refinement was a law unto itself in Aristotle's morality, as it is today; there is room, however, in the great-souled character for that righteous indignation which

⁷ One is reminded here of the institution of the *λειτουργία*; it is not quite our "public service."

modern society is fast supplanting by a cynical shrug of the shoulders.⁸

The discussion of justice, which follows in Book v, presents certain aspects worthy of comparison with present-day life. Justice exists for Aristotle as much in the proper distribution of wealth as in any other phase of social life; the maldistribution of wealth, as well as of worth, is for him a prime source of conflict in society.⁹ The justice of distributing to each according to his worth has a ring of socialism to it; and Aristotle perceived as plainly as Upton Sinclair the confusion and disagreement between political parties as to the right interpretation of worth¹⁰ in terms of freedom, wealth, good birth, and virtue. The logical basis of communism,¹¹ which is certainly not "to him that hath shall be given," is clearly understood by Aristotle. There is a modern note, likewise, about the brief discussion of monetary values in Book v; the law of supply and demand is as well known to him as to Stuart Chase, and Aristotle goes as far as any inflationist in suggesting (what is obvious) that the value of man-made currency should be subject to change at will by men in fixing prices. He winds up this excursus with an example in which, to our amusement, he rates five Greek beds as equal in value to one Greek house.

It is in the two books on friendship that Aristotle is, perhaps, most appreciated by the modern reader. His constant reiteration of the knowledge of good as an active, not passive, principle of conduct,¹² his emphasis upon the moral significance of all action, his rejection of the Platonic "knowledge is virtue," find their harshness mellowed here by the experience of a gentleman. In Book VII he recognizes the natural place of certain desires in human life, which are to be, of course, regulated and checked by a true moral choice; he is aware of the pathological conditions, the abnormalities and perversions, that crop out in society. His

⁸ Humility is no virtue to Aristotle, Spinoza, or Sherlock Holmes; see a story called "The Greek Interpreter," by A. Conan Doyle.

⁹ v, v, 12 (1130b) and v, 6 (1131a).

¹⁰ v, v, 7 (1131a).

¹¹ v, vii, 11 (1132b); in passing, it seems to me that the last paragraph in Book v is an afterthought, a later lecture note.

¹² Cf. Milton's "I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed," etc., in the *Areopagitica*.

tolerance in discussing these phases of conduct is amplified in Books VIII and IX, to which the treatment of weakness of will is a proper transition.

It is, therefore, in the two books on friendship, VIII and IX, if anywhere, that Aristotle has endeared himself to posterity. A man of the world speaks in these pages; his comments on friendship are only common sense, tact, and decency, set down in a handbook of conduct. There is nothing especially profound about them; yet they give all the requisites for the establishment of abiding friendship. Of a subject that was a commonplace in ancient rhetoric Aristotle made probably the most charming portion of his book, a fact which alone might give cause to doubt those who base their adverse criticism of Aristotle, as Jaeger has pointed out, entirely upon his style. The simple strength of a style that can affect us as deeply as in these books on friendship has conquered even the roughness of their form as lecture notes. They are governed by the principles of honor, justice, and equality emphasized in the earlier books; they are here applied to the closest of human relationships. The phrase *ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἅπ' ἐσθλά* with which they end is the keynote here; and nowhere else does the true ideal of honor receive a better statement than in Book IX,¹³ coupled as it is with a noble conception of a life lived always at its highest and best; this reminds us more of Stevenson's "El Dorado" than of Pater's "clear, gem-like flame," if we seek for a modern parallel.

It is difficult in a brief paper to sketch all the parallels and divergences between the ethical background represented in Aristotle's *Ethics* and that of the present day. But so rare are the qualities of open-minded urbanity, tolerance, and universal sympathy in human relations that one should be glad to draw them from any source whatever. And this is the impression Aristotle leaves with us: that of a man ripened with a cosmopolitan experience and sincerely concerned with the psychological and ethical problems of humanity in a democratic social system, treating these problems by the only criterion that has ever attained an accepted validity—the human intelligence acting in accordance with virtue.

¹³ IX, viii, 9-11 (1169a).

THE HOMERIC LOTUS

THE ANΘΙΝΟΝ ΕΙΔΑΡ, THE ΜΕΛΙΗΔΕΑΣ ΚΑΡΠΟΣ

By HOMER ECONOMOS
Bard College
Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

As I was looking over the April, 1934, issue of the monthly ecclesiastical magazine 'Ο Ποιμήν, published in Mytilene, my attention was attracted by a very interesting article on "The Homeric Lotus" by the Most Reverend Metropolitan Bishop Athenagoras of Paramythia, Greece. Not only does the article [a part of Bishop Athenagoras' work, *Light from the Depths of the Ages* (Φῶς ἀπὸ τὰ Βάθη τῶν Αἰώνων), which is to be issued very soon] arouse the curiosity of the reader, but the suggestions therein seem at times to lead to a definite and clear explanation of the problem of the lotus. The author begins with the wanderings of Odysseus and his followers and tells how Homer in the *Odyssey* informs us of Odysseus' visit to the

γαίης Λωτοφάγων, οἳ τ' ἄνθινον εἶδαρ εἶδουσιν.
. . . ἀλλὰ σφι δόσαν λωτοῖο πάσασθαι.
τῶν δ' ὅς τις λωτοῖο φάγοι μελιηδέα καρπὸν,
οὐκέτ' ἀπαγγεῖλαι πάλιν ἤθελεν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι,
ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ βούλοντο μετ' ἀνδράσι Λωτοφάγοισι
λωτὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι μενέμεν νόστου τε λαθέσθαι.¹

Then Bishop Athenagoras asks:

But what was this magic fruit that so allured the followers of Odysseus that they wished to remain forever with the Lotus-eaters, "forgetting their return" to their country? A great question!

The most ancient scholiast on Homer writes:

Τοὺς Λωτοφάγους ἐν Λιβύῃ ὑποτίθενται εἶναι οἱ νεώτεροι· μέχρι δὲ νῦν

¹ *Od.* ix, 84-97.

Αἰγύπτιοι βοτάνην ξηραίνοντες ἀλοῦσι καὶ πέττοντες ἐσθίουσι. λωτός δ' ἐστὶ βοτάνη εὐδομος. ἔνιοι δὲ μυρόλωτον λέγουσι βρώμα.

And explaining οἱ τ' ἀνθινον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν, he says:

"Ἴδιον εἶπεν, ὥς τοιούτου ὄντος τοῦ λωτοῦ οἶον ἄνθους τινός· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε δένδρου τινός καρπὸν ἢ σπέρμα, ἀλλ' ἀνθινον. εἶδαρ δὲ βρώμα.

Bishop Athenagoras calls attention to the fact that the ancients were ignorant of the identity of the lotus, although they were eating it every day. But, he asks, do we moderns know it? Opening the first handy encyclopedic lexicon² at the word "Lotus," we read:

Genus of plants of the family *κολοβοάνθη*, containing herbs with yellow flowers. The better known kind and most common substance of the meadows throughout Europe is the *lotus ceratiphorus*, commonly called "wild-trefoil"; it provides excellent pasture; it is perhaps the lotus of Homer, which is praised by him as the food of horses. According to Sprengel and Fraas, however, various kinds of trefoil and melilot (a kind of trefoil) more nearly correspond to the Homeric lotus. These, of course, include also the wild lotus of Dioscorides. The ancients distinguished various other kinds of lotus, particularly: (a) the tree lotus, according to Dioscorides, a huge tree found throughout southern Europe. This is called *κέλτις* by the moderns; it is commonly called in Thessaly *λουτός* or *λωτός*, but elsewhere *μικροκκουκιά* ("small-bean") and *κουτσομηλιά*. Its fruits (*λωτόμηλα*) are edible, and the wood is strong and very useful for carving. Other kinds of lotus are: (b) in Homer and Theophrastus, likewise woody, the jujube (a sort of plum), *ζίζυφος*, commonly called the jujube tree, and (c) the Egyptian lotus, which is a sort of *nenuphar* growing by the Nile, whose root and seeds are edible.

Also under the word *λωτοφάγοι* we read:

Lotus-eaters were called by the ancients a pacific and hospitable race, living to the north of Africa on the island of the "Small Bank." They ate the sweetest fruits of a native kind of lotus, from which they also made wine. Odysseus and his friends who had lost their way they welcomed and gave to them to eat of the lotus; and the followers of Odysseus were so fascinated by it that they forgot their country.

According to these authorities the lotus is the small-bean (*μικροκκουκιά*), the *κουτσομηλιά*, and the jujube tree! Hoefer, however, a recent writer, does not accept the *thammas lotus* in his

² N. Γ. Πολίτου, *Λεξικὸν Ἑγκυκλοπαιδικόν*: Athens, Barth and Hirst.

Histoire de la Botanique but considers the *ceratonia siliqua* the lotus of Homer, and he justifies his view thus:

The flowers of the *ceratonia siliqua* have a saccharine taste, very pleasant, due to the small, tender bulbs, which are present long before the calyx falls. And this completely justifies the phrase, *ἄνθινον εἶδαρ*, which gave the scholiast so much trouble. As far as the small bulbs are concerned, one needs only to taste them in order to find immediately that honeyed taste which reminds us of the *μελιηδέα καρπὸν* of Homer.

Philippe Champault,³ however, rejects the above view of Hoefer and accepts as the lotus of Homer simply the *datte*:

Évidemment il s'agit de la datte qu'il est impossible de peindre en trois mots d'une façon plus poétique et plus indicative. D'ailleurs *ἄνθινον* signifie *fleur-esque* (s'il est permis de forcer ce mot) plutôt que *fleuri*.

And he prefers the date to the jujube tree and the carob (*ceratonia siliqua*) because the date has a much higher value in taste and nourishment and because the date, in contradistinction to the carob tree, is clearly an African tree, found neither in Greece nor in Italy. Besides, he says, note further that the date produces a sort of honeyed syrup, which is called by the natives "date-honey."

If, then, the Homeric lotus is neither the jujube tree nor the wild-trefoil nor the small-bean (*μικροκκουκιά*) nor the nenuphar that grows by the Nile, nor yet the *χαρούμπα* (carob), which is so greatly praised by the botanist Hoefer, that is, the food of the swine, which the Prodigal Son of the Bible desired in vain, nor the *datte* with its honeyed fruit and its syrup, what, then, is the Homeric lotus, the *ἄνθινον εἶδαρ*?

Lotus is a Semitic word, and the exact translation of it is given to us by Homer himself, when he calls it *μελιηδέα καρπὸν*. Lotus, then, means *καρπός* ("fruit"); but is not a *δένδρινος καρπός* like apples, oranges, lemons, peaches, nuts, and all the other edible fruits that trees furnish us. The Homeric lotus is *ἄνθινος*—it is not the plant (*φυτόν*); it is something that is planted, grows, blossoms, and produces fruit, like the strawberry, the tomato, the potato, the eggplant, and so on. But these fruits are not *μελιηδεῖς*. The

³ *Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée*: Paris (1906), 400.

Homeric blooming fruit is *μελιγδής*, "sweet as honey." It is *καρπός*, *the καρπός par excellence*, and from Homer down to the present day it has borne the same name—unfortunately, however, not recognized. It is *the καρπός*; it is the *καρπούζι*, and by this name both the melon and the watermelon are understood.⁴ *Καρπούζι* is the common modern Greek name for watermelon; it is also used in Turkey and Albania with the same meaning. In other words, the writer associates the word *καρπός* of Homer with the word *καρπούζι* or *καρπούς* and holds the view that the Homeric *καρπός* is nothing else than the watermelon—the term *καρπούζι* being derived immediately from *καρπός*.

This, then, is the lotus of Homer, *καρπός μελιγδής*. And, indeed, there where Odysseus and his followers (supposedly in northeastern Africa) ate the lotus is a sandy land that still grows the sweetest watermelons. Today the land of the Lotus-eaters is called simply Beach, celebrated in the whole country for its watermelons (*καρπούζια*), its lotus.

⁴ Cf. honeydew melon.

Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent directly to Roy C. Flickinger, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.]

TERENCE, *PHORMIO* 231-34 AND LIVY I, xxviii, 4-6

Itane tandem uxorem duxit Antipho *iniussu meo?*
nec meum imperium—ac mitto imperium—non *simultatem meam*
revereri saltem! . . . *O Geta*
monitor!

Nam . . . *iniussu meo* Albani subiere ad montes, *nec imperium illud meum*
sed consilium et imperii *simulatio fuit* . . . *Mettius* . . . *ductor* . . . *Mettius*
. . . *machinator*. . .

In both passages indignant superiors are describing after the event the disobedience and trickery of subordinates, Antipho and Geta being balanced by Mettius. *Proditione ac perfidia sociorum* in Livy balances *causam tradere advorsariis* in Terence (vs. 237). Severe punishment is carried out or contemplated in both cases. The identity or similarity of phrasing is indicated by the italics in the quotations, with even *simulatio* possibly a mechanical echo of *simultatem*. The whole constitutes either an extraordinary coincidence or stylistic evidence of thorough assimilation of Terence's plays.

We see, therefore, that quoting from Terence was not limited to his aphorisms. Horace adapts considerable passages (compare Ter., *Eun.* 46-49, 57-63 and Hor., *Sat.* II, iii, 262-71; Ter., *Ad.* 414-18 and Hor., *Sat.* I, iv, 105-26), besides quoting the *cena dubia* of *Phorm.* 342 in *Sat.* II, ii, 77 and the *hinc illae lacrumae* of *And.* 126 in *Ep.* I, xix, 41, which is quoted also by Cicero (*Cael.* xxv, 61).

The fact that Cicero also (*Att.* II, xix, 1) quotes part of the passage from Terence cited at the beginning of this Note—an indication that it was a familiar passage—lends additional weight to the point I am making.

As compared with the quoting of convenient epigrams (as is sometimes done even by people who do not know the sources), reminiscences—often more or less unconscious—argue an even greater vogue of the author than the more obvious repetition of *sententiae*. Such an echo of Cicero also, from *Cat.* I, 6, we find almost certainly in Livy I, xlv, 9.

CLYDE MURLEY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

CHEFS, MODERN AND ANCIENT

Auguste Escoffier, famous chef, died at Monte Carlo, February 12. *The New York Times* (February 13) reports that one day

a group of chefs were discussing the case of the renowned Vatel, who had committed suicide because the soles had not arrived in time for dinner. What, they asked M. Escoffier, would he have done if he had been in Vatel's place? The master turned his hand up in a gesture of carelessness:

"I would have taken the white meat of chickens—very young chickens," he said, "and I would have made filet of sole with it. No one would ever have known the difference."

Far more resourceful was a gentleman named, appropriately enough, Daedalus, who wrought miracles in Trimalchio's capacious kitchens. We read in Petronius (*Satyricon* 69 f.):

For when there had been set before us what we took to be a fat goose engirdled with fish and all sorts of birds, Trimalchio said, "Friends, everything you see here was made from one substance. . . . I swear to you by my hope of growing in grace and not in grease that my cook produced the whole business out of pork. Why, the fellow is absolutely priceless. If you but express the desire, he will make you fish out of tripe, pigeon out of bacon, turtle-dove out of ham, and chicken out of a knuckle of beef."

HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

THE "MOOSE" OF THE HERCYNIAN FOREST

Possibly Caesar's credulity was not so completely imposed upon by the nature fakers of his day as the modern reader assumes from his account of the stiff-legged goats, called *alces*, of the Hercynian

forest.¹ Coming after his relatively plausible descriptions of the Gauls and Germans and their environment, this strange monstrosity strikes as discordant a note as does Clement of Rome when he drags in the fable of the Phoenix.² Few myths, however, are made from whole cloth, and there is in certain mammals a well-attested peculiarity that may easily have furnished the basis for Caesar's story. I refer primarily to the so-called "nervous" goats.

A few years ago my father and I were being entertained by a certain bird and animal fancier who told us, among many other interesting things, of a trip in the South during which he saw some "nervous" goats, as the natives pronounced the expression. These goats, when frightened, became rigid and unable to move. They were scared stiff. Sometimes they would fall over and lie rigid for a while. However, they would soon recover and get up, being apparently normal once more. We felt no especial inclination to doubt his word on this score, but other reporters of this strange phenomenon have frequently encountered uncompromising skepticism and ridicule. Caesar's account is usually condoned but no less disbelieved.

Frederick Simpich tells³ of an Alabama planter whom he once heard tell, to a group in Berlin, of the "nervous" goats of Alabama—how one can walk up to them and push them over when they are having an attack of "nerves," how they dislike dizzy climbing, et cetera. This honest man was greeted with derision and dubbed "Baron Munchausen von Florence, Alabama." However, ten years later Simpich himself saw the goats perform, vouching for his story by presenting actual photographs of the goats in the midst of their seizures.

Jay L. Lush⁴ cites numerous published studies of the phenomenon and tells how one Texas farmer imported a herd of "nervous" goats from his boyhood home in Tennessee for the sole purpose of establishing his own veracity among his neighbors. This herd was said to be furnishing regular Sunday-afternoon entertainment for

¹ *B.G.* VI, xxvii.

² *Epistle to the Corinthians* xxv.

³ "Smoke over Alabama," *National Geographic Magazine* LX (1931), 703-758, especially 733 f.

⁴ "Nervous Goats," *Journal of Heredity* XXI (1930), 243-247.

the region. Certain noises are more effective than others in bringing on an attack. Not all the goats in a herd are stricken at once, but any given individual may be thrown into a fit repeatedly, provided a brief interval is allowed for recovery. The seizures usually last about twentyseconds. When a stricken goat remains standing, as they often do, he may be pushed over, and he will fall as heavily as if he were made of wood, lying rigid until the attack is over. Caesar's goats were unable to raise themselves if thrown down by any accident.⁵

By Lush we are informed that goats are not the only animals manifesting this phenomenon. It occurs even in human beings and seems to be an inherited trait. Somewhere I have read of a certain New Yorker who was liable to such attacks when trying to catch a subway train.

What Caesar says about the absence of leg-joints in these goats will have to be regarded as etiological fiction. Similar suspicion attaches to his account of the sleeping posture of the animals; neither can we accept the undermining of the trees at face value. On the other hand, what he says of their falling and inability to rise reads exactly like a description of the temporary paralysis of the "nervous" goats of the South. It seems reasonable to admit the possibility that his story is founded on fact.

J. MERLE RIFE

EARLHAM COLLEGE
RICHMOND, INDIANA

⁵ Cf. *B.G.* VI, xxvii, 5: *Si quo afflictae casu conciderunt.*

Book Reviews

[Review copies of classical books should be sent to the Editorial Office of the JOURNAL at Columbia, Mo. Such works will always be listed in the department of Recent Books, and those which seem most important to the readers of the JOURNAL will also be reviewed in this department. The editor-in-chief reserves the right of appointing reviewers.]

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, United States of America, Fascicle 3; University of Michigan, Fascicule 1, by Wilhelmina Van Ingen: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1933). Pp. 84, 48 plates. \$3.

The following list will suggest the contents of this comparatively little-known collection and the number of specimens in each category: Egyptian, Protodynastic and Dynastic, 13; Ptolemaic and Roman, 31; Prehistoric of Mysia, 4; Uncertain of Asia Minor, 2; Palestinian, 1; Cypriote, Bronze Age, 35, Iron Age, 60, Miscellaneous, 26; Late Helladic III, 3; Corinthian, 6; Geometric, 4; Attic, b-f., 9; r-f., 6; w.g., 2; Greek and Italic Black Glazed, 63; Hellenistic Moulded, 1; Etruscan, Protocorinthian and Corinthian Imitations, 13, Impasto, 3, Red Ware, 2; Bucchero, 11; b-f., 2, r-f. Imitations, 2; Faliscan, 2, Arretine Potters' Stamps, 89; Apulian, 6; Gnathian, 6; Canosan, 1; "Teano," 4; Campanian, 46; Calenian, 1; Italic, Miscellaneous and Uncertain, 144; Roman and Provincial White, 11; Punic and Roman, 57; Gallic Terra Sigillata, 14; Terra Nigra, 7; Rhenish, 11.

It is thus a characteristically "university" collection, assembled by professional teachers with an eye to the illustration of a great variety of types of pottery rather than to the acquisition of show pieces. That the collectors have evinced so little interest in Greek wares is surprising, less than 5 per cent of the whole being purely Hellenic. There is no South-Balkan Neolithic pottery in the collection, no Minoan, no Greek Orientalizing, and but three examples of Helladic.

Some one hundred and fifty pieces are described as "duplicates" from the Metropolitan, Wallraf-Richartz, and Lavigerie museums.

The mention of the name of George R. Swain as the photographer of the collection is sufficient of itself to guarantee the quality of the photography, though one could wish that a centimetre-stick had been included with some of the more important vessels.

Miss Van Ingen has well performed what must often have seemed a thankless and wearisome task. Her descriptions of the individual pieces are neat, concise, and accurate, and she refuses to become lyrical or even eloquent when she comes to an occasional attractive specimen. The temptation to distort the balance of a catalog has not often been so well resisted.

On three very minor points I venture to differ with Miss Van Ingen: (1) I cannot but feel that she (with one or two other American editors of the *Corpus*) makes a mistake in following the lead of the Italian editors in prefixing "select bibliographies" to each department of vases. The tendency of such a practice is to degrade the great undertaking of the Union Académique Internationale to the level of the textbook. (2) The youth painted on the exterior of the cylix 2601 (Pl. xv, lc) is, I think, walking rather than standing. On the analogy of similarly posed figures elsewhere, I judge that the right foot is about to pass the left in his stride. (3) The "preparatory gray slip" on the White Ground lecythus 2604 (p. 32) beneath the white slip has, I think, no existence in fact. What is seen in such cases is apparently nothing more than the body of the vase, which has been darkened by the "reducing" process that is necessary to blacken the glaze, and then protected by the exterior slip against the "oxidizing" process that concludes the operation within the kiln.

A. D. FRASER

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

WILLIAM W. TARN, *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind* (Raleigh Lecture on History, Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIX): London and New York, Oxford University Press (1933). Pp. 46. \$1.

In the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vi, 437, Tarn discussed

briefly the aims of Alexander as indicated by the so-called "Prayer at Opis" and the mass-marriages at Susa and claimed that Alexander desired to promulgate the ideal of the brotherhood of man. Wilcken in his *Life of Alexander* contended that Alexander had no notion of the brotherhood of man but desired only to unite Macedonians and Iranians, the two dominant peoples in his empire. In the present lecture Tarn proceeds along the line indicated in his article, "Alexander Helios and the Golden Age," *Journal of Roman Studies* xxii (1932), 135, to trace the concept of kingship after Alexander and to point out that the connection of *homonoia* with kingship goes back to him. The argument presented here is cogent, and the lecture as a whole is as difficult and brilliant a piece of work as Tarn has recently done. There are fourteen pages of notes and an additional note of three pages on the date of Euhemerus, in which Tarn contends that this author has been placed too late, about 280, when he should rather be considered a friend and contemporary of Cassander.

THOS. A. BRADY

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, United States of America, Fascicule 4; Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md., Fascicule 1, by David Moore Robinson with the Assistance of Mary W. McGehee: Cambridge, Harvard University Press, (1934). Pp. 59, with 48 plates. \$5.

This fascicle is a splendid contribution to the *Corpus* and a most welcome addition to our bibliography of Greek vase-painting. The vases described and illustrated, forming but part of Professor Robinson's collection, represent the Minoan, Helladic, Mycenaean Cypriot, Geometric, Ionic, and black-figured styles of vase-painting. Several of them are published for the first time and a number are of special interest. A cylix with the signature of Xenocles, an amphora signed by Nicosthenes, a pinax from Attica bearing a representation of the good and bad strife of Hesiod (*Works and Days* 20 ff. Cf. *A.J.A.* xxxiv [1930], 352 ff.), and four Panathenaic amphoras are among the most interesting examples of the collection.

The Panathenaic amphorae are important because of their representations and their date. They apparently were given as prizes between the years 420 and 414 B.C. or during the period that followed the peace of Nicias, 421 B.C., and therefore they fill the long existing gap in the series of these artistic prizes. On one side they bear the usual and conventional representation of Athena and on the other a footrace of boys. When we remember that very few representations of boy athletes on such amphoras are known, we realize the importance of the contribution of the Baltimore examples. In describing these amphoras the author gives a most interesting account of the Panathenaic festivals during the Peloponnesian war. With the black-figured vases is described, very appropriately because of its painting in the black-figured style, an altar from Scione, which contributes greatly to our knowledge of early Greek painting.

The vases are masterfully described, dated, and attributed to schools and masters. The plates are excellent and deserve the highest praise. The color plate XLV gives a very good idea of the color scheme and the excellent drawing common in the white-ground lecythi. At the beginning of each section of the description of the plates a very useful bibliography is given. The vases of the Robinson collection were selected with the purpose of illustrating a course in Greek vase-painting and, therefore, the fascicle in which they are described and illustrated is not a mere catalog but an excellent companion to the study of Greek vase-painting to the end of the black-figured style. As such it will be indispensable to all students of Greek art and archaeology.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
SAINT LOUIS

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XLIII: Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1932). Pp. viii+179. \$2.

Volume XLIII of this distinguished series of *Studies in Classical Philology* contains the following: (1) Milman Parry, "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making: II. The Homeric Language as the Language of an Oral Poetry," 1-50; (2) Alston Hurd

Chase, "The Metrical Lives of St. Martin of Tours by Paulinus and Fortunatus and the Prose Life by Sulpicius Severus," 51-76; (3) John J. H. Savage, "The Manuscript of the Commentary of Servius Danielis on Virgil," 77-121; (4) Arthur Patch McKinlay, "Studies in Arator: I. The Manuscript Tradition of the *Capitula* and *Tituli*," 123-166. In addition there are the following summaries of dissertations for the degree of doctor of philosophy, 1931-32: (in classical philology) George Forrester Davidson, "*Quo modo et qua ratione poetae scaenici graeci Euripides Menanderque personas in scaenam introduxerint*," 170-173; Elvion Owen, "*De ratione civili Aeschylea*," 175-176; (in classical archaeology) Donald Gay Baker, "Animals on the Coins of Greek Cities," 167-168; Job Edgar Johnson, "Roman Portrait Art, Its Source and Realism," 173-175; (in Indic philology) Purushotam Vishvanath Bapat, Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga: A Comparative Study, 168-170. An Index, 177-179, concludes the volume.

Professor McKinlay's first study in Arator considers a grouping of the manuscripts of Arator's *Acts of the Apostles* by a comparison of the *tituli* and *capitula*. He concludes that these are mutually helpful in arranging a classification of twenty manuscripts. The work is supplemented by three notes, as follows: Note 1. Ruth Marie Addy, "How the redactor reworked the first edition," 158-163; Note 2. Celia Gertrude Lowe, "Whether the first or second editor followed the Bible more closely," 163-165; Note 3. Celia Gertrude Lowe, "How strictly are the *capitula* a resumé of Arator?" 165-166.

Dr. Chase explains the derivation of the metrical lives of St. Martin of Tours by Paulinus and Fortunatus from the prose life of the Saint by Sulpicius Severus. Considerable attention is given to the manuscript of Sulpicius with a diagram of the *stemma*.

Of greater interest to students of Vergil will be Professor Savage's examination of the manuscript of the Commentary of Servius Danielis. The author has been able to make a personal examination of the twenty-one manuscripts which he discusses in accurate terms. The question for which he was seeking the answer he states as follows: "Have we in the codices of Daniel a conflation of two

distinct commentaries or simply one commentary to which additions have been made from various sources?" The conclusion of Professor Savage "on the external evidence so far adduced for the existence of a commentary separate from that of the vulgate Servius" is as follows: "There seem to have been two distinct parts to this original commentary; whether the work was in this state before it was fused with Servius or not it would be difficult to determine." In a succeeding paper the author will continue to present the results of his researches.

The first fifty pages of the book, containing Dr. Parry's study of the Homeric language as the language of oral poetry, will command the attention of every reader because of the importance of the subject treated. The author adopts as a sound principle the conclusion that "the Homeric poems were composed in a poetic language wherein old and foreign forms had been kept and new forms brought in by reason of the help they gave the epic poets in making their hexameters" (p. 5). "Further," he says, "the nature of Homeric poetry can be grasped only when one has seen that it is composed in a diction which is oral, and so formulaic, and so traditional."

Careful consideration is given to the place of the formula in the traditional poetic language of oral poetry. The poets' fondness also for an archaic element is brought out. Likewise, an artificial element must be reckoned with in traditional poetic language. After discussing the dialects, Ionic, Aeolic, and Arcado-Cyprian, from which the Homeric language was drawn, the author concludes (p. 40) that "epic diction was more or less altogether the creation" of Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic singers. He finds only slight traces of an Ionic element beyond the mere change in pronunciation. The theory of an Aeolic Homer is rejected, but the theory of an Aeolic diction is accepted. Ionic singers carried on the tradition of Aeolic heroic poetry. Evidence from the language does not permit us to "say that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are single poems, nor [to] show how the singer, or singers . . . have put smaller poems and whole passages together." Dr. Parry tries to show how the oral poet works and to set forth the great influence of the formula in

traditional poetry. His treatment of the subject should be read by all students of Homer.

L. R. DEAN

DENISON UNIVERSITY
GRANVILLE, OHIO

MARY JOHNSTON, *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy* (Plautus and Terence): Geneva, N.Y., W. F. Humphrey Press (1933). Pp. viii+152. \$2.

Professor Johnston's study is a Columbia University dissertation written under the direction of Professor Charles Knapp. Its purpose stated in the preface is

to establish definitely and finally, if possible, the conventional significance of the use made of the side-entrances on the Roman stage by the two chief Roman writers of comedy, Plautus and Terence.

In the introductory chapter (1-19) an examination of the views expressed in various periodicals and in annotated editions of the two authors shows clearly two things: First, the orientation of the theatre of Dionysus at Athens was such that characters entering from the spectators' right actually came from the direction of the harbor or the market place, and characters entering from the left came from the direction of the open country. Therefore, the stage conventions about entrances to the Athenian stage were the result of topographical conditions. Second, the views of scholars about the continuation of the traditions of the Greek drama and theatre at Rome neither agree on the subject of the use of side entrances nor base their arguments on sound and comprehensive evidence.

Having very clearly shown the need of a careful study of the problem, Professor Johnston proceeds to a thorough examination of all the evidence that can possibly throw light on the subject. Chapter ii (20-33) is devoted to a study of the text of each play in order to determine the stage setting. Chapter iii (34-37) deals with the problem of *Angiportus*, *Posticum*, and *Horti* and tries to decide, within the limits of evidence, which necessarily is often scanty, which plays made use of these other means of entrance or exit

(from stage or from houses that form part of the stage setting).

Chapter iv (38-59) examines the use of *Forum*, *Rus*, and *Portus* in the plays, and Chapter v (60-67) discusses the significance of first entrances at the opening of the plays.

Having assembled all available evidence, the author proceeds in Chapter vi (68-105) to attack the heart of her problem, i.e., The Significance of the Side Entrances. Certain plays afford definite indications of the significance of the side entrances, and the evidence thus obtained is carefully studied.

Chapter vii (106-119) deals with intervals and interludes; Chapter viii (120-126) with an interesting comparison of the positions of characters as portrayed in the Vatican miniatures of the *Phormio*,¹ wherein the positions of the characters fit the stage setting as the author supposes it to have been in seventeen out of the twenty-one miniatures.² Chapter ix deals with action off stage.

In the Conclusion (150-152) Professor Johnston sums up as follows:

It seems clear that we may say, finally, that on the stage of the Roman theater the side-entrance to the right of the spectators was used for entrances and exits of characters from and to the city and the forum, and that the side-entrance to the left of the spectators was used for entrances and exits of characters moving from and to the port and foreign parts, and, probably, from and to the country as well.

It makes little difference that this conclusion is much in accord with the usual ideas about the side entrances. The need for a scientific study of the problem in its entirety has been clearly shown, and the examination of the evidence has been made with thoroughness and care. The author is to be congratulated on a work that deals so competently with an interesting problem.

JOHN FLAGG GUMMERE

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

¹ Leslie Webber Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence Prior to the Thirteenth Century*, Vol. I, The Plates; Vol. II, The Text: Princeton, University Press (1931, 1932).

² Professor Morey's theory (*op. cit.*) is that the characters in the miniatures are aligned in the order in which they speak in the scene illustrated.

Hints for Teachers

[Edited by Dorothy M. Bell, 216 Park Place, Brooklyn, New York. The aims of this department are threefold: to assist the inexperienced teacher of Latin, to help the experienced teacher keep in touch with matters of interest in the professional world, and to serve as a receiving centre and distributing point for questions and contributions on teaching problems. Questions will be answered by mail or in the pages of this department. Contributions in the form of short paragraphs dealing with projects, tests, interest devices, methods and materials are requested. Anything intended for publication should be typed on stationery of regular size. All correspondence should be addressed to the editor of this department.]

An Horatian Menu

In this year of the Bimillennium Horatianum Latin clubs and classes will find especial interest in a dinner menu gleaned from Horace's own vocabulary by Jessie D. Newby of Central State Teachers College, Edmond, Oklahoma.

An attractive *hors d'œuvre* for the first course may be made with a radish, a bit of celery, a small green onion, a slice of deviled egg, and an oyster or olive fried with a strip of bacon. For the main course there is a variety of meats from which to choose and a mushroom sauce, if desired, with which to serve it. The salad (*epityrum*) is made of olives and cheese. *Panis* is also possible, though Miss Newby suggests that rice balls (*oryza*) make an excellent substitute. Grape ice or baked apple may be used for dessert. The various possibilities for an Horatian menu are given as follows:

TABULA CIBORUM

GUSTUS

Ostreae (or) *Conchae*

Caepae

Apium

Ova

Radices

Oliva cum lardo

CENA

Caro ovilis (or *bubula, vitulina, suilla, porcina, ferina*)*Lepus, Afra avis, anser, gallina**cum fungis**Sal**Piper**Epityrum in lactuca cum placentis**Faba cocta**Caulis* (or *Rapulum*)*Oryza*

SECUNDA MENSA

Vinum glaciatum (or *Poma cocta*)*Nuces***Bulletin of the Service Bureau for Classical Teachers**

The Service Bureau for Classical Teachers, New York University, Washington Square East, New York City, has recently published an Index of all of its available material. The Index covers five hundred Mimeographed and Small Printed Items; Latin Notes Supplements; Bulletins; and Miscellaneous Background Material and Additional Equipment Aids for Classical Teachers (wall posters, pictures, scrapbooks, pamphlets, books, etc.). The price of the Index is 15 cents (20 cents postpaid).

A Suggestion for a Latin Club Program

Mary Kovats, secretary of the Washington High School Latin Club, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, writes that a radio broadcast program proved so interesting in their Latin club that it was continued for several meetings. One of the features of the broadcast, which was sponsored by the Broken Bone Chariot Company, was a story hour conducted by "Aunt Philibertia." Her Roman stories told in modern bedtime fashion proved so popular that the feature had to be continued for the greater part of the semester.

Guedalla's *Wellington* for Latin Pupils

Fascinating background material often neglected by teachers of Caesar consists of biographies and memoirs of other great generals of history. Since the World War countless such books have been written, not only personal recollections of such commanders as Pershing, Ludendorff, and Hindenburg or of critics skilled in mili-

tary science, such as Colonel Repington, but also new accounts of Napoleon, Grant, Lee, and others.

In this long list one of peculiar interest for readers of Caesar's Commentaries is *Wellington*, by Philip Guedalla, New York, Harper and Brothers (1931). Wellington studied Caesar's genius and ability as a general. His biographer keeps Caesar's Commentaries constantly in mind and quotes from them frequently or makes skilful and innumerable allusions to them.

When young Colonel Wellington sailed for India at the start of his career, he took along a trunkful of books just purchased. On the bookseller's list, devoted for the most part to works on India, stand Plutarch's *Lives* and Caesar's Commentaries, along with Ainsworth's *Latin Dictionary*. Two years later Plutarch had been discarded, but Caesar was retained. "He found," writes Mr. Guedalla, "his Caesar curiously relevant to Indian military problems; for he confessed in later years how much he learned from him, 'fortifying my camp every night as he did,' and borrowing Caesar's methods of crossing rivers by basket-boats."

Another lesson acquired no doubt from Caesar was the importance of food supply. "Camp-kettles, shirts, and brushes haunted him; his dreams are full of army biscuit; and his housekeeping anxieties are in strange contrast with the grave ablatives absolute of Caesar."

Like the Roman commander on one occasion, the Iron Duke was deeply tried by officers requesting leaves. "I may be obliged to consent to the absence of an officer, but I cannot approve of it. . . . In my opinion there is no private concern that cannot be settled by power of attorney." He refused leaves, saying, "Otherwise, between those absent on account of wounds and sickness and those absent on account of business or pleasure I should have no officers left."

In connection with the difficulties of the battle with the Nervii Caesar wrote *neque ab uno omnia imperia administrari poterant*. Similarly Wellington, in speaking of his distaste "for mountain warfare, where the nature of the ground prevented him from being everywhere at once," makes this statement: "It is a great disadvantage when the Officer Commanding in Chief must be absent

and probably at a distance. For this reason there is nothing I dislike so much as these distended operations, which I cannot direct myself."

Guedalla's description of the English position at Waterloo is reminiscent of the customary position of Caesar's line. Wellington "had his troops in position on a ridge, one of his favorite ridges with an easy slope toward the enemy and shelter for his men behind its crest." Of the battle he says, "It was to be the old style of attack . . . the waiting line behind the crest, the volley long deferred, and then the bayonet." Suggestive of Caesar's impulsive act in the Nervian battle is Guedalla's account of how at one moment Wellington "formed a line of shaky infantry himself, like any company-commander, within twenty yards of the flash of an oncoming French column."

Guedalla points out that Wellington, as he grew older, began to allude to himself in the third person. "Caesar had done the same; but in Caesar's case the habit was a mere convenience for narrative. In Wellington's it served to indicate an odd dualism. For he seemed to recognize two persons in himself—an aging gentleman of modest tastes who could be happy in congenial society and a public figure whose requirements were often more majestic." As the Duke became more and more an honored institution of the British public, "Caesar's Commentaries were compared unfavorably with his Despatches" by his flatterers.

These incidents serve to show the enjoyment that may be found in reading a biography of a great general written by a scholar and stylist trained in the classics. Wellington's own opinion of the value of the classics survives in a letter to a lady regarding the education of her son. After mentioning mathematics, languages, and military tactics, Wellington wrote:

He will not be able to converse or write like a gentleman . . . unless he understands the classics; and by neglecting them, moreover, he will lose much gratification which the perusal of them will always afford him, and a great deal of professional information and instruction.

MRS. KEITH PRESTON

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., and John Barker Stearns, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; G. A. Harrer, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., for the Southeastern States; Eugene Tavenner, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Frederic S. Dunn, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., or to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.]

This department will present everything that is properly news of general appeal, but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible. Whenever feasible, it is preferable to print programs of meetings which would draw an attendance from a large area as live news in advance of the date rather than as dead news after the event. In this connection it should be remembered that the December issue, e.g., appears on November fifteenth and that items must be in hand five or six weeks in advance of this date.]

Where We Are Educated

According to the *Educational Directory* just issued by the Federal Office of Education, nearly 50 per cent of all institutions of higher learning in the United States are located in ten states. Of 1662 institutions included in the new college guide 783 are found in the following states: New York, 100; California, 99; Illinois, 99; Pennsylvania, 97; Texas, 86; Iowa, 64; Ohio, 64; Massachusetts, 62; Missouri, 60; and North Carolina, 52. There are 158 teachers colleges in our country. Of this number, 13 may be found in Pennsylvania, 10 in Wisconsin, and 10 in Massachusetts. New York also leads in number of normal schools, while California, Texas, and Iowa report more junior colleges than any of the other states.

Approximately one third of all institutions of higher learning in the United States are controlled by the Protestant denominations. About one fourth are state controlled, one fourth privately controlled, about one ninth under Roman Catholic denominational control, and one ninth under district or city control.

There are 229 colleges for men in the United States, 270 colleges for women, and 1163 coeducational institutions. Of this 1662 total, 107 are Negro institutions of higher learning.

Tulsa

The Oklahoma Education Association met in Tulsa, February 8. The following is the program of the Latin section, of which T. M. Pearson of Tahlequah was chairman and Marion Loar of Okmulgee was secretary: Music, Anna Mae Hunter, Tulsa; "The Influence of Horace in the Living of Men," John O. Moseley, University of Oklahoma; "Suggestions for Celebrating Horace in High Schools," Jessie D. Newby, Central Teachers College; Round Table, led by Isabel Work, Oklahoma Chairman of the Bimillennium Horatianum, Southeastern Teachers College, Durant.

Agnes Scott College

The Alpha Delta chapter of Eta Sigma Phi at Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, under the direction of the faculty advisers, Catherine Torrance, Lillian Smith, and Martha Stansfield, presented a program of music, dance, and drama in honor of the two-thousandth anniversary of the birth of the Latin poet Horace.

The program consisted of a paper on "The Relation of Sappho and Alcaeus to Horace" by Willie Florence Eubanks; a Greek dance representing the return of Apollo to his winter home, accompanied by the Muses; a Latin dramatization of Horace's "Bore" (*Satires* I, ix); and "The Lovers' Quarrel" (*Odes* III, ix), sung in duet form by Mrs. S. G. Stukes and Betty Lou Houck. During the intermission between the Greek dance and the dramatic sketch members of the club and of the Horace class, assisted by the audience, sang "O Fons Bandusiae" (*Odes* III, xiii) and an English translation of the third and second odes from the third book.

The audience was composed of the members of the college community and their friends and pupils from the neighboring high schools who had been especially invited.

The Horatian Bimillennium in Rome

The Roman celebration of the Bimillennium Horatianum consists of appropriate series of lectures. These series have been organized by the Institute of Roman Studies, which is under the patronage of His Majesty the King of Italy, the Honorary President being His Excellency Benito Mussolini. The first series, devoted to "the illustration of the personality and the work of Horace," is being delivered by a number of distinguished Italian scholars. The lectures of the second series, on "Horace in the Literature of the Various Countries," are given by representatives of twelve nations. The course was opened on February 15 with a treatment of "Horace in the Literature of the United States" by A. W. Van Buren of the American Academy in Rome. To the Roman public a specially acceptable feature of the Horatian year is the series of Saturday afternoon illustrated lectures by G. Q. Giglioli of the University of Rome on "The Via Appia Illustrated in Its Monuments," following step by step the poet's famous journey from Rome to Brundisium. At this last series of lectures there has been, literally, "standing room only."

Recent Books¹

[Compiled by Russel M. Geer, Brown University.]

- BAXTER, J. H., and JOHNSON, CHARLES, *Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*: London and New York, Oxford University Press (1934). Pp. xiii+465. \$3.50.
- BRADY, THOMAS ALLAN, *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks (330-30 B.C.)* (University of Missouri Studies, Vol. x, No. 1): Columbia, University of Missouri (1935). Pp. 88. \$1.25.
- CALLIMACHUS, *The Hymns, With the Hymn of Kleanthes*, Translated into English Verse by Arthur S. Way: London, Macmillan and Co. (1934). Pp. 42. 2s. 6d.
- Cambridge Ancient History*, Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth, Vol. x, *The Augustan Empire*: Cambridge, Eng., University Press; New York, Macmillan Co. (1934). Pp. xxxii+1058. 37s. 6d.; \$11.
- Cambridge Ancient History*, Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth, Vol. of Plates iv, Illustrating Vols. ix and x, Prepared by C. T. Seltman: Cambridge, Eng., University Press; New York, Macmillan Co. (1934). Pp. xiv+210. 12s. 6d.; \$4.
- Consolatio ad Liviam*, Prolegomenis, Commentario Exegetico, Indice Instructa ab Arnolfo Witlox. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Groningen: Maastricht, Van Aelst Bros. (1935). Pp. xxii+176.
- ELDERKIN, GEORGE W., *Antioch on the Orontes*, Vol. I, *The Excavations of 1932*: London, Oxford University Press; Princeton, Princeton University Press (1934). Pp. 164. \$12.
- EYRE, EDWARD, Editor, *European Civilization, Its Origin and Development*, by Various Contributors, Vol. I, *Prehistoric Man and Earliest Known Societies*: London and New York, Oxford University Press (1934). Pp. vi+1321. 25s.; \$8.75.
- FLICKINGER, MINNIE KEYS, *The 'Apapria of Sophocles' Antigone* (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. II): State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., The Author (1935). Pp. 82. \$1.25.
- GORR, ADOLPH, *The Influence of Greek Antiquity on Modern German Drama*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania (1934). Pp. 105.

¹ Including books received at the Editorial Office of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, Columbia, Mo.

- GRAVES, ROBERT, *Claudius the God and His Wife Messalina*: London, Arthur Barker (1934). Pp. 575. 10s. 6d.
- HADLEY, HERBERT S., *Rome and the World To-Day*, A Study, in Comparison with Present Conditions, of the Reorganization of Civilization under the Roman Empire, Foreword by William Allen White, Revised by Agnes Hadley, Third Edition: New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1934). Pp. 320. \$2.50.
- HAYWARD, FRANK H., *Marcus Aurelius, A Saviour of Men*: London, George Allen and Unwin (1935). Pp. 303. 10s. 6d.
- Hesiod in English Verse*, Translated by Arthur S. Way: London, Macmillan and Co. (1935). Pp. 72. 3s. 6d.
- HOMER, *The Iliad*, Translated into Blank Verse by Sir William Marris: London and New York, Oxford University Press (1935). Pp. viii+566. \$2.25.
- Homeric Hymns with Hero and Leander in English Verse*, Translated by Arthur S. Way: London, Macmillan and Co. (1934). Pp. 90. 3s. 6d.
- KIEFER, OTTO, *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*: London, George Routledge and Sons (1934). Pp. 390, with 16 plates. 25s.
- KNOCHE, ULRICH, *Magnitudo Animi*, Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines römischen Wertgedankens (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 3): Leipzig, Dieterich (1935). Pp. 93. M. 5.50.
- KUHN, ALBERT, *Roma*, Ancient, Subterranean, and Modern Rome in Word and Picture, with a Preface by Cardinal Gibbons: New York, Benziger Bros. Pp. 617. \$7.50.
- LIVIOUS, T., *The Story of Scipio Africanus*, Part I, In Spain and Sicily, Edited by C. G. Pope: London, Frederick Muller (1934). Pp. 170. 5s.
- MARSH, FRANK BURR, *A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B.C.* (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, Vol. v): London, Methuen and Co. (1935). Pp. xii+427, with 5 maps. 15s.
- MAYO, THOMAS F., *Epicurus in England (1650-1725)*: Dallas, Tex., Southwest Press (1934). Pp. 237. \$4.
- MCEWAN, CALVIN W., *Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship* (Chicago University Oriental Institute Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, No. 13): Chicago, University of Chicago Press (1934). Pp. xii+34. \$1.
- NASH-WILLIAMS, A. H., *Introduction to Continuous Latin Prose for Upper Forms*: London, Macmillan and Co. (1934). Pp. 112. 2s.
- PAGE, DENYS L., *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, Studied with Special Reference to Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*: London and New York, Oxford University Press (1934). Pp. ix+228. 10s.; \$3.50.
- PLATO, *The Republic*, With an English Translation by Paul Shorey, Vol. II (Loeb Classical Library): London, William Heinemann; Cambridge, Harvard University Press (1934). Pp. lxxi+398. 10s.; \$2.50.
- RAND, EDWARD KENNARD, and JONES, L. W., *Earliest Book of Tours*, With Supplementary Descriptions of Other Manuscripts of Tours (Studies in

the Script of Tours, Vol. II; Mediaeval Academy of America Publication No. 20): Cambridge, Mediaeval Academy of America (1934). Pp. xvii+136, with 60 plates. \$18.50 (to members, \$14.80).

ROBERTS, G. D., *Anthology of Latin and English Verse*: London, Macmillan and Co. (1934). Pp. 179. 4s. 6d.

SINCLAIR, THOMAS A., *A History of Classical Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle*: London, George Routledge and Sons; New York, Macmillan Co. (1935). Pp. viii+421. 12s. 6d.; \$3.50.

THUCYDIDES, *Speeches and Funeral Orations*, Translated into English by Arthur S. Way: London, Macmillan and Co. (1934). Pp. 224. 5s.

VERGILIUS MARO, P., *The Aeneid, Eclogues, and Georgics*, Translated by J. W. Mackail, Introduction by Charles L. Durham: New York, Modern Library (1934). Pp. 366. \$0.95.

VERGILIUS MARO, P., *The Bucolics of Vergil*, Edited by Frederic J. DeVeau: London and New York, Oxford University Press (1935). Pp. xxiv+220. \$1.25.